

RAPE AND WORSHIP: TOWARD A FEMINIST THEODICY

A Professional Project
Presented to
the Faculty of the
School of Theology at Claremont

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Ministry

by
Karen Dayle Moore

May 1989

This professional project, completed by

Karen Dayle Moore,

*has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty
of the School of Theology at Claremont in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF MINISTRY

Faculty Committee

Ann Laves

Mary Elizabeth Mullins Moore

J. Lewis Fetter

April 18, 1989
Date

Allen J. Moore
Dean

Copyright 1989
Karen Dayle Moore
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Abstract

Rape and Worship: Toward a Feminist Theodicy

Karen D. Moore

This project attempts to respond to the allegation that Christianity, as a patriarchal religion, condones, if not generates, the sex crime rape, and consequently the patriarchal religion and its God ought to be abandoned. Unlike conventional theodicies which focus on arbitrary, mundane, and evil events in the world, a feminist theodicy must focus on the problem of violence within the kingdom of God, specifically the context known as the act of worship in the patriarchal church. This study takes seriously the existence of violence within worship, while retaining a belief in an omnipotent and perfectly good God.

Three analogies are presented and explained: (a) women as victims of rape are to the rapist what the sacrificial animal is to the offerer, (b) the act of worship is to the offerer what the act of rape is to the rapist, and (c) crucifixion is for Jesus what the annunciation [rape] is for Mary. With graphic and grotesque detail the first analogy is explicitly depicted by seven similarities between animal offerings and autobiographical descriptions of sadistic rape. The explanation of the second analogy is a study of Judges 21 which includes three rape narratives. These are viewed within their particular context as righteous. The third analogy is explained through a study of the eucharist, and a study of the Lucan birth narrative, Gabriel's confrontation of Mary. A close examination of the social relevance of rape myths to the early readers, of Mary's responses to Gabriel's responses in

pattern of rape victims, and of Mary's own historical world view liberates the position that the annunciation is merely a veiled myth of the rape of Mary. These analogies require the reader to confront the violence in worship and advance a shocking metaphor, rape is worship. Horrifying as it may seem, the concluding metaphor points toward a theological understanding that violence is at the heart of Christian worship, without negating the presence of an all good and powerful image of God.

Acknowledgements

This project was written from the inside to the outside. It was as if the walls were built before the foundation was laid. Thanks to Ann Taves, Mary Elizabeth Moore, and J. Irwin Trotter who helped to lay that foundation. Special thanks to Charlotte Ellen for her extensive resources. Both the Venice United Methodist Church and the Big Pine United Methodist Church particularly, Adolph Griffith, Marilyn Baker and Doris Fredendall, have been patient, and accepting of my desire and need to complete the project. Countless hours of reading and commenting were completed by Cindy Grubb and Jean Restek. My mother, Gertrude V. Moore was an boundless source of encouragement, and I am most grateful.

Table of Contents

Chapter

1. Introduction	1
2. Ritual	17
The Term Ritual	17
Structure of the Chapter	22
Aztec and Israelite Ritual	24
Victims in The Ritual of Rape	30
Conclusion	37
3. Myth	40
The Term Myth	40
Structure of the Chapter	45
Animal Sacrifice in the Kingdom of God	46
Rape in the Kingdom of God	52
Conclusion	68
4. Sacrifice	71
The Term Sacrifice	74
Structure of the Chapter	81
The Crucifixion of Jesus: An Act of Sacrifice	82
The Annunciation of Mary: A Sacrifice of Rape	89
Conclusion	109
5. Toward a Feminist Theodicy	111
Tension	116
The Affective Power	117
Is the Metaphor Preachable?	118
Education	123
Pastoral Care	124
The Structural Power	125
Concluding Remarks	130
Bibliography	132

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Problem Addressed by the Project

This project attempts to respond to the allegations that Christianity as a patriarchal religion, condones, if not generates, the sex crime of rape, and consequently the patriarchal religion, and its God ought to be abandoned. Mary Daly argues that Christianity has been subsumed into what she calls the patriarchy. Both Mary Daly and Jane Caputi accuse Christianity of misogyny, and further claim that the hatred of women which is imbedded in such traditions leads to the actual acts of violence, such as rape, against women.¹ Among Daly's first allegations is the observation that, "sexism was inherent in the symbol system of Christianity itself and that a primary function of Christianity in Western culture has been to legitimate sexism."² In later works, Daly insists:

The Most Unholy Trinity of rape, genocide, was and is a logical expression of phallocentric power [patriarchy]. The circle of destruction generated by the Most Unholy Trinity and reflected in the whole Trinitarian symbol of Christianity will be broken when women, who are by patriarchal definition objects of rape, external

¹ The intention of Mary Daly's writings since her first book, The Church and the Second Sex (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), has been to expose the sexism in patriarchal religions. Jane Caputi, The Age of Sex Crime (Bowling Green, Oh.: Bowling Green Univ. Popular Press, 1987), 120.

² Daly, The Church and the Second Sex, 17.

and internalize a new self-definition whose compelling power is rooted in the power of being. The casting out of the demonic Trinities is female becoming."³

Clearly Daly alleges Christian complicity in violence against women, and cites that the only solution is to cast out the demonic Trinities of patriarchy and Christianity. Caputi's allegation is concise: "certainly much of traditional patriarchal religious propaganda – from the earliest 'creation' myths through judeo-christian notions of female sexual filth, primordial blame, and evil – provided fundamental legitimation for the practices of modern sex crimes."⁴

Daly's rhetoric denies Jews and Christians an opportunity to protest the seriousness of her indictment. She charges: "'Informed' Christians and Jews may protest that rape and brutality are alien to our own heritage. The reader, then, should refer to biblical passages which tell a different story, namely that there is precedent for looking upon women as spoils of war."⁵ Similarly, Caputi charges that,

Contemporary sex crime is a continuation of that on going religious/sexual warfare which is patriarchy.

.....
Within modern western patriarchy, the sexual violation of women, although nominally despised, and tabooed, is secretly desired, approved, institutionalized and ultimately mandated.⁶

The allegation that the patriarchal Christian church is a misogynist organization which condones the rape of females cannot be ignored. A response to these allegations requires feminists to grapple with questions of

³ Mary Daly, Beyond God the Father (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973), 122.

⁴ Caputi, 120.

⁵ Daly, Beyond God the Father. 116.

⁶ Caputi, 120.

theodicy. Unlike conventional theodicies which focus on the arbitrary, mundane, and evil events of the world (i.e., human beings assaulting one another, murdering, or raping), a feminist theodicy must focus on the problem of violence within the church, a part of the kingdom of God, specifically the context known as worship.

Importance of the Problem

A study by a division of the United Methodist church at the beginning of this decade discloses that one out of every twenty-seven United Methodist Women are victims of rape.⁷ Statistics from the State of California cite an increase in the number of reported rapes. The numbers increase from 7,281 in 1971 to 13,545 in 1981. It is documented that a total of 88,519 women in California reported rape between 1971, and 1981.⁸ Most anthropologists and sociologists suspect the actual number of rapes is much higher. Few victims report rape because they experience such humiliation, guilt, and rejection by friends and family members. Such studies suggest that one out of every three women is already a rape victim or will become a victim of rape during her lifetime. These statistics, and the allegations that the patriarchal Christian church is a misogynist organization which condones the rape of females cannot be ignored, but serves as an imperative which must be confronted.

Rape questions the victim's existence, her identity as female, and her relationship with God. The crisis of rape, called rape trauma syndrome, disrupts her daily routine: eating habits, sleeping patterns, emotional

⁷ Letty Russell, et al., Feminist Interpretation of the Bible (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985), 96.

⁸ State of California, Department of Justice, Crime in California (Sacramento: 1981), 6, 21.

responses, and thought processes.⁹ The victim of rape may need to move, or change jobs.¹⁰ Rape affects her relationship with her spouse, or lover, her children, and with other members of her family.¹¹ Rape trauma is manifested as a paradigm which is operative in all aspects of the victim's life. Rape is the ultimate violation.¹²

Theological questions are raised by those who are victims of rape. These questions are traditional questions of suffering, guilt, shame, anger, confession, repentance, abandonment by God, and reconciliation.¹³ The victims may ask, "Why would God let this happen to me?" The victim precipitation theory informs the victim that it is her fault that she was raped.¹⁴ Such theories suggest that she ought to believe that God wanted her to be raped. God's relationship to violence is central to those questions. Theological issues cannot be discussed in isolation. The questions raised by the rape experience must be answered by the individuals who acutely experience rape in conjunction with the local and collective communities of Christian Faith.¹⁵

⁹ Ann Burgess and Lynda Holmstrom, Rape: Victims of Crisis (Bowie, Md.: Prentice-Hall, 1974), 37.

¹⁰ Ibid., 38-47.

¹¹ Ibid., 59-63.

¹² Judith Rowland, Ultimate Violation (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), xiii.

¹³ Marie Fortune, Sexual Violence: The Unmentionable Sin (New York: Pilgrim, 1983), 191-216.

¹⁴ Menachem Amir, Patterns in Forcible Rape (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1971), 259.

¹⁵ Fortune, 218-224.

The purpose of this project is not only to raise the theological question, but also to provide a theological perspective that can aid individuals and communities who choose to address the rising concern for victims of sexual violence. Marie Fortune addresses many ways that the pastor and community may help victims of violence.¹⁶ Her study is a Christian response to the external violence against women. Daly and Caputi imply that the patriarchal religions do not respond, but perpetuate the acts of evil and rape of women. As previously stated they charge that such institutions ought to be collapsed. René Girard, on the other hand, suggests that violence and the sacred are the same thing. "For the operations of violence and the sacred are ultimately the same process."¹⁷ In this study it is argued that there is connection between the violence of rape and the violence of worship. This study takes seriously the existence of violence within worship, while retaining a belief in a omnipotent, and perfectly good God. The thesis of this project is that, **within the kingdom of God, violence, specifically animal sacrifice, crucifixion, and rape, is central to the act of worship of the present day patriarchal church.**

Major Terms

The major terms in this project are: (1) the kingdom of God, (2) violence, and (3) worship.

Kingdom of God

The kingdom of God is the theocracy in which theodicy is discussed. According to Stephen Davis, there are five common beliefs about God in the study of theodicy:

¹⁶ Ibid., 221-224.

¹⁷ René Girard, Violence and the Sacred (Baltimore: John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1977), 258.

1. There is one God.
2. God created the world.
3. God is omnipotent.
4. God is personal.
5. God is perfectly good.¹⁸

The theocracy known as the kingdom of God, originates with Jesus, is with us now, and remains with us until the end of time.¹⁹ It is also a metaphor. According to Sallie McFague a metaphor is "an assertion or judgement of similarity and difference between two thoughts in permanent tension with one another which describe reality in an open ended way, but have structural as well as affective power."²⁰

Jesus' use of the metaphor, kingdom of God, came into tension with the prevailing Roman Empire, whose emperor was seen as a god. Jesus' use of the metaphor also came into conflict with the temple authorities in Jerusalem.²¹ But the term kingdom is nostalgic, and comforting to the minds of the early listeners, and reminds them of better times, economic prosperity, and tribal unity. It brings to the minds of the early listeners the time of the King David.²² Today, the word kingdom has the ring of patriarchy and the

¹⁸ Stephen Davis, et.al., Encountering Evil (Atlanta, John Knox, 1981), 2.

¹⁹ John Bright, The Kingdom of God (Nashville: Abingdon, 1983), 224, 230.

²⁰ Sallie McFague, Metaphorical Theology (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 42.

²¹ Luke 6.20, 9.62, 12.31, 12.28, 13.29, 14.1, 17.21, 18.16, 23.51, 18.17, 18.29, 21.31, and 22.16.

²² Bright, 39-41.

oppression of over half of the world's population. Rosemary Ruether says that the Christian church has barely begun to recognize the seriousness of the feminist criticism of patriarchal language, such as the term kingdom.

This is more than just a matter of language and iconography. It also involves the fundamental way that the divine is imagined to act in relation to the world, modeled after social power roles. The fundamental authority of the Biblical Revelation is at stake. If this tradition is based on a symbol system that reflects the conquest of women by men, then its revelatory author is tainted by social ideology. Its image of God, creation, redemption and future hope are interwoven with characteristics oppressive to half of the human race. Such characteristics are both evil, and blasphemous, since they act as sanctions of evil in the name of the Divine!²³

Ruether declares that kingdom is a model of a theocracy which is not liberating, but is oppressive.

Kingdom of God has two paradoxical, if not contradictory meanings within the context of this project. First, from a traditional point of view, it is the liberating theocracy which comes through the incarnation. Second, from a feminist perspective, it is a dead metaphor. Nelle Morton attests the following:

The word God may at one time have been metaphor, but in common usage over the centuries, along with many other religious symbols, it has lost its redemptive power. Since it has been identified with power-over, male rulership, and male control, it has been separated from the reality it first ushered in. The entire culture and political structures are extensions of this dead metaphor.²⁴

In contrast to Morton's statement, the metaphor God is not dead, it is the kingdom of God, the patriarchal theocracy which is dead. Historically, it is the fulfillment of God's promise of freedom and liberation. Today, the

²³ Rosemary Ruether, "Christology and Feminist: Can A Male Savior Help Women?" Occasional Papers [United Methodist Board of Education and Ministry] 1, no. 13 (Dec. 25, 1976), 1.

²⁴ Nelle Morton, The Journey Home. (Boston: Beacon, 1985), 172.

metaphor no longer brings comfort, but challenges the believers to answer the allegation that the kingdom of God brings oppression to half the world's population. In light of the allegations made by Caputi and Daly, the kingdom of God, as a liberating metaphor to the western world, is a dead metaphor. At best kingdom of God may be a prophetic metaphor, in that it presents the challenge that evil is within its boundaries and must be addressed.

Violence

Often evil is divided into two forms: moral and natural. Moral evil refers to acts of human beings who rape, murder, or rob, and the victims of such actions. Natural evils refer to such events as earthquakes, diseases, famine, and floods.²⁵ Violence is the form of evil confronted in this paper, which is not to say violence is the only form of evil. There are other forms of moral and natural evils. This project is concerned more specifically with violence and worship. Animal sacrifice and the crucifixion are two forms of violence known to be aspects of worship. Rape is not commonly associated with worship. A purpose of this paper is to show that association.

Legally, rape is defined as a violent sexual crime committed against a woman or women.²⁶ Rape may without question be considered a violent crime, and it may involve the use of the genitals as a weapon, but it is not at its root, sexual.²⁷ In the scope of this project, rape is defined from the perspective of the victim. Consent is crucial to the definition. Rape is the violation of a woman's individual being without her consent. If the genitals of

²⁵ Davis, 5.

²⁶ State of California, Department of Justice, Women's Rights. (Sacramento: 1983), 19.

²⁷ Ibid., 19.

an individual body are contacted by another without the consent of the former, then it is rape. If consent is forced or manipulated, that is not voluntary consent, and it is considered rape. If consent is denied to the person, then genital contact of any form, is rape.

In the context of this project four aspects of rape are examined: (1) the ritual of rape, (2) the story or myth of rape as described in the biblical texts, (3) rape as a sacrifice, and (4) rape as metaphor.

Worship

Evelyn Underhill's definition of worship extends beyond the human experience of Christian worship, including the social, cultural, and psychological aspects of all forms of human worship of the Divine.

Worship, in all its grades and kinds, is the response of the creature to the Eternal: nor need we limit this definition to the human sphere. There is a sense in which we may think of the whole life of the Universe, seen and unseen, conscious and unconscious, as an act of worship, glorifying its Origin, Sustainer, and End.²⁸

Underhill claims that Christian worship stresses, "the activity of Jesus Christ in which we become united to Christ's external self-offering for us."²⁹ As such Christian worship is not the entrance into the kingdom of God, but presumes entrance of the individual by conversion to Christianity.

Underhill claims there are four chief means of human expression of worship: (1) ritual or liturgical pattern, (2) symbols or significant image, (3) sacrament, and (4) sacrifice. This project refines these four expression as associated specifically with Christianity:

²⁸ Evelyn Underhill, Worship (Westport, Conn.: Hyperion Press, 1937), 3.

²⁹ James White. Introduction to Christian Worship (Nashville: Abingdon, 1980), 22.

1. The ritual articulates the story, using gestures.
2. The biblical story or the myth explains the ritual.
3. Sacrifice is the coming together of the ritual, myth, and God.

Work Previously Done in the Field

Recent publications concerning theodicy, rape and feminist theology introduce notions which lead to the present discussion about rape, worship, and the kingdom of God.

Theodicies lead to various conclusions. Davis suggests that the logical problem of evil may be resolved by the declaration that "all the evil that exists in the world is due to the choices of free moral agents whom God created, and no other would have had a better balance of good over evil than the actual world will have."³⁰ John Hick attempts to resolve the problem of evil with a free will defense. God creates free beings who have the choice to love God, and some choose not to love God. Hick seems to imply that free will poses the problem of moral evil. He says, "Thus that one is morally imperfect (i.e., that there is moral evil), and that the world is a challenging and even dangerous environment (i.e., that there is natural evil), are necessary aspects of the present stage of the process through which God is gradually creating perfected finite persons."³¹ Davis' and Hick's positions are theodicies by Davis' definition, because each attempts to show that "God can be omnipotent and perfectly good despite evil."³² According to John Cobb's interpretation of Davis' definition, others such as John Roth, Frederick

³⁰ Davis, 72.

³¹ Davis, 48.

³² Ibid., 4

Sontag, and David Griffin modify theism and thus are quasi-theists and do not truly qualify as writers of theodicy.³³ Edward Madden and Peter Hare maintain that "neither theism nor quasi-theism is able to make sense of the facts of evil and that this incompetence constitutes a good reason for rejecting each one of them."³⁴ Certainly Caputi and Daly would agree with them, since in their minds theism is patriarchal, and misogynistic.

Brooten, Biale, Brownmiller, Tribble, and Ruether contribute feminist works fundamental to the discussion of theodicy, concerning themselves with the biblical context of rape. Brooten and Biale use rabbinic literature to confirm Brownmiller's thesis that rape is a means used by "all men to hold all women in fear."³⁵ Their discussion of rabbinic literature describes the social and historical context of women in antiquity, thereby affirming theories which suggest that patriarchal religions subjugate females to the authority of males. Phyllis Tribble challenges the traditional understanding of the kingdom of God, and suggests the possibility that her four women of terror (Hagar, Tamar, an unnamed woman, and the daughter of Jephthah) have their own integral relationship with God. She indicts some Christian interpretations: "their passion has its own integrity; no comparisons diminish the terror they knew. . . . To seek redemption of these stories in the resurrection is perverse."³⁶

³³ Davis, 172.

³⁴ Edward Madden and Peter H. Hare, Evil and the Concept of God (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1968), 12.

³⁵ Susan Brownmiller, Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1975), 15.

³⁶ Phyllis Tribble, Texts of Terror (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 2.

Rape is mentioned metaphorically and phenomenologically in Ruether's work, but it is not the focus of her work. Ruether's work presents canonical and extracanonical texts as guides toward female images of the Divine over and against the treachery, rape and oppression by the patriarchs. She theorizes that primitive Christianity is egalitarian, and was transformed during the first five centuries into a patriarchal structure. Therefore, a female identity in Christian theology is implicit in the Scriptures.³⁷ The thesis of this project affirms her conjecture that a female identity is implicit in the biblical texts. McFague says that feminist "reformers believe that the root-metaphor of Christianity is human liberation, not patriarchy, and that liberation for women can occur with the Christian paradigm."³⁸ The whole of the Christian religion need not be cast aside for new stories, if we can confront the violence that is central to Christian worship, in some of the biblical stories, and in the celebration of the eucharist.

Daly, defining herself as other than Christian, urges an unremembering of the history taught to women by the male establishment. A consciousness of rape, pejorative subordination as male property need not continue to be the paradigm of the lives of women. In its place is the possibility of a religious consciousness of gender identity: female.³⁹ Daly argues for the exorcism of the male image of God, and creating a female image of Deity. Merlin Stone, along with others, points out that Christianity and other patriarchal religions

³⁷ Rosemary Ruether, Sexism and God-Talk (Boston: Beacon, 1983), 99-109.

³⁸ McFague, 164.

³⁹ Mary Daly, Beyond God the Father, xvi-xvii.

exorcised the female image of God centuries ago.⁴⁰ In contrast to Daly's statement, this project argues that the female image of God is already exorcised and is to be born again through the process of reclamation of the gender identity: female. One approach to this, proposed by Daly in her earlier work, is to reclaim, the primary female in Christianity, Mary.⁴¹ As this project shows, that is not an easy task.

From a male perspective of Jungian psychology, Bradley TePaske theorizes that the ritual of rape is an archetype which emerges from the Self. In Jungian psychology the Self is the image of God. TePaske's theory builds from Carl Jung's previous work on symbols of transformation in the Mass.⁴² This project uses both TePaske's and Jung's theories in the synthesis of rape and worship. This project builds on Jung's "Transformation Symbolism in the Mass" showing that violence is present in worship in the celebration of the Eucharist, and violence is present in the act of rape.⁴³ The intention of both the rituals and myths in the two violent acts is sacrifice, and the consequent transformation that brings union with God.

Scope and Limitations of the Project

This project examines God's relationship to violence and worship. The heart of the study is rape and worship. If violence is shown to be central to worship, then God is present in violence. Some would say that is reason

⁴⁰ Merlin Stone, When God Was a Woman (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1976), xvii.

⁴¹ Ibid., 29.

⁴² Bradley TePaske, Rape and Ritual (Toronto: Inner City Books, 1982), 38 footnote 76.

⁴³ Carl Jung, "Transformation Symbolism in the Mass." Psychology and Western Religion (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1984), 97-194.

either to modify God's omnipotence or goodness, or put an end to patriarchal religions and male images of God. This project agrees that violence is present in Judeo-Christian rituals, biblical myths, and sacrifices, and further that Judeo-Christian teachings condone the rape of women, and thereby perpetuate the sex crime. Nevertheless, the concluding metaphor, rape is worship, compels us to reject patriarchy, without rejecting either the omnipotence or the goodness of God.

Procedure for Integration

Analogy is traditionally used by Christian philosophers for uniting natural with revealed theology.⁴⁴ Analogy in this instance is used in a discussion of revealed theology, the understanding of God as revealed in the revelation of Christ. This projects attempts to use analogy to rework deeply embedded mythic structures within biblical texts, and to elicit a new description of the traditional Christian theocracy, the kingdom of God. Nelle Morton suggests that in the early days of philosophy of language; analogy, by some, subsumed metaphor as it did simile and allegory.⁴⁵ In this case analogies free the metaphor rather than subsume it. McFague says, "Thinking metaphorically means spotting a thread of similarity between two dissimilar objects, events, or whatever, one of which is better known than the other, and using the better-known one as a way of speaking about the lesser known."⁴⁶ Rape is widely known as a terrorizing form of violence, while worship is the lesser known form of violence. The acts of rape and the acts

⁴⁴ Edwin Lionel Mascall, Existence and Analogy (London: Longmans, Green, 1949), 92.

⁴⁵ Morton, 220.

⁴⁶ McFague, 15.

of worship are integrated through a discussion of their analogous characteristics. The ritual of rape and the ritual of worship show analogous human gestures. The study of myth draws an analogy between the meaning of rape and the meaning of animal sacrifice. Likewise, analogies are drawn in the study of sacrifice. The analogies conclude with a metaphor that intertwines the violence reported in the analogies of rape and worship which hopefully compel a transformation in the understanding of the kingdom of God.

Chapter Outlines

The first chapter compares and contrasts the human treatment of other human beings in the rituals of sacrificial worship and the rituals of rape using the book of Leviticus, Fray Diego Duran's study of Aztec worship, and A. Nicolas Groth's and Jean Birbaum's study of rapists.⁴⁷ The thesis of the first chapter is: women as victims of rape are to the rapist what animal offerings are to the priest or the person who offers it.

Using the narrative of the closing chapters of the book of Judges, TePaske's theory of rape, and Angel Rodriguez's study of ancient hebraic sin and burnt offerings, the second chapter describes how offerers (sinners) seek God in the act of worship and the parallel way the rapist seeks God in the act of rape.⁴⁸ The thesis of the chapter is: the act of worship is to the offerer what the act of rape is to the rapist.

Using the birth narrative in the gospel of Luke, Edward Edinger's sacrificial paradigm, and Carl Jung's "Transformation Symbolism in the Mass,"

⁴⁷ Fray Diego Duran, Book of the Gods and Rites and the Ancient Calendar (Norman: Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1971); and A. Nicolas Groth, and Jean Birbaum, Men Who Rape (New York: Plenum, 1979).

⁴⁸ TePaske; and Angel Rodriguez, Substitution in the Hebrew Cultus (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews Univ. Press, 1979).

the third chapter examines God's search for a covenant with human beings in the act of sacrifice.⁴⁹ The crucifixion is for Jesus what the annunciation is for Mary: an act of sacrifice, is the thesis of the chapter.

The concluding chapter presents the metaphor, rape is worship. It may be the grammatical preference to say the metaphor, rape as worship, rather than rape is worship. However, the metaphor, rape as worship, subsumes rape into a larger context known as worship. In this project, rape and worship are analogous. To say rape is worship, is to make an equation like metaphor. Rape and worship are seen within a unique context. To say that God is love is a similar equation like metaphor. God is not subsumed by love nor is love subsumed by God. They are equated. They are placed in a context in which the similarities and differences can become visible. The phrase, rape as worship, diminishes what McFague calls tension, while rape is worship heightens the tension, because the similarities and differences are so apparent.⁵⁰ The metaphor, rape is worship, is a foreign notion. Few would think that the two can be equated. The purpose of the project is to demonstrate that they are equated. In fact, they are woven together by that which is most abhorred: violence.

⁴⁹ Edward Edinger, Ego and Archetype (Harrisonburg, Va.: Penguin, 1972); and Jung.

⁵⁰ McFague, 31-54, and 145-194.

CHAPTER 2

Ritual

The purpose of this project is to examine our theological understanding of worship and rape through a study of the common structures of both rape and worship: ritual, myth, sacrifice, and metaphor. This chapter focuses on the component of ritual. The purpose is to identify the similarities and the differences in the ritual of worship and the ritual of rape. It is not the intention to degrade rituals of worship nor to condone or exalt the ritual of rape. Rituals of Judeo-Christianity substantiate the allegation that the patriarchal religion perpetuates sex crimes against women. The thesis of this chapter is that women as victims of rape are to the rapist what sacrificial animals are to the priest or to the person who offers them.¹ In this case, priests are not rapists, nor are rapists, priests. The analogous relationship between the victim of rape and the victim of sacrifice is to be scrutinized and analogized in the context of rituals.

The Term Ritual

The ritual of rape and the ritual of worship are usually described in contrasting terms. Groth and Birnbaum characterize the motives in the ritual of sadistic rape as bizarre, aggressive, violent, and abusive.² For some

¹ The priest in this sentence refers to the priests and their performance of rituals that are described in Leviticus and Exodus.

² Groth and Birnbaum, 44.

offenders the ultimate satisfaction is the murdering of each of their victims, not only to eliminate a witness to the crime, and thus avoid detection, but also killing is intrinsically pleasurable to them; it is "better than an orgasm."³

Underhill, on the other hand describes the purpose of ritual in worship in the following way:

Indeed as ritual worship develops in depth and beauty it is seen more and more that its rhythmic phrases and ceremonies, its expressive movement, dialogues, concerted outbursts of praise, are all carrying something else; the hidden supernatural action of the group or church by which the ritual is being used."⁴

Underhill's adjectives and adjective phrases such as beauty, expressive movement, outburst of praise, contrast radically with Groth's adjectives and descriptive terms such as bizarre, aggressive, violent, or abusive. Contrasting descriptions of their qualitative values does not negate the possibility for the comparison of the rituals. Qualitative values merely acknowledge that human beings define a dualistic world in which there is both good and evil. Worship is valued to be a good ritual, and today, rape is valued by some to be an evil ritual.

Not all feminists, however, value Christian worship as "good." Daly's view is different from Underhill's. Daly questions the beauty and intrinsic good of Christian ritual.

It [ritual] is essentially a memory. Sexist ritual is a false memory, placing present experience in the context of a history that is in fact a deadly fiction, a pernicious lie."⁵

Daly asserts that Christian ritual, as history, reminds us that violence is sane,

³ Ibid., 57.

⁴ Underhill, 24.

⁵ Daly, Beyond God the Father, 142.

and that is a false memory. "Females and males have been put to death amid rites and incantation. It [violence] is legitimated and made part of the social reality that is considered part of the normal scheme of things."⁶ Daly's understanding of Christian ritual as a false historical memory certainly questions Underhill's value of ritual as beauty and raises the question of its social value. It is not the intention of this project to state, as Daly does, that Christian ritual is a pernicious lie. Rather, the intention here is to show the parallels between the violence in the ritual of rape and the ritual of worship.

The ritual of rape has not always been considered evil. Bernadette Brooten argues that rape according to the laws of the ancient Israelites is just another method to obtain a bride. Marriage is not considered evil.⁷

In the context of this chapter the definition of ritual refers to the overt behaviors associated with sacrificial rituals described in Leviticus and Exodus. Roland De Vaux's study divides the passover sacrifice into eight broad categories.⁸ His categories are not limited to the specific behaviors of the priest or the offerer in relation to the victim. He includes the use of unleaven bread, bitter herbs, the time of sacrifice, and the fact that the bones are not broken.⁹ De Vaux's emphasis on the overt behaviors of the priest and offerer toward the victim is limited. He does however, identify that the

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Bernadette Brooten, "Violence Against Women in Rabbinic Literature" Paper presented at the Beyond Violence Conference, Claremont Women in Religion, Claremont, Ca., 28 Feb. 1985, 3.

⁸ Roland De Vaux, Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice (Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press, 1964), 4-8.

⁹ Ibid., 4-12.

selection of the victim is the first act in the ritual.¹⁰ He gives casual mention to the immolation, and the pouring out of the blood at the foot of the altar.¹¹ However he does not suggest that these acts help to give the ritual its shape and form.

Rodriguez's study of sacrifice interprets the meaning of two specific gestures from sacrificial ritual: the laying on of hands, and the manipulation of blood.¹² This chapter excludes any interpretation of the behavior, and concentrates on the identification of specific human behavior in the rituals of offerings described in the religious and psychoanalytic texts. The task of interpretation is undertaken in subsequent chapters.

According to Leviticus, the Israelites brought their peace, guilt, sin, and votive offerings to the tent or tabernacle.¹³ The overt human gestures in the sacrificial ritual of Israelite worship were largely as follows:

If a man's offering is a sacrifice or peace offering, if he offers an animal from the herd, male or female, he shall offer it without blemish before the Lord. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering and kill it at the door of the tent of meeting and Aaron's sons the priests shall throw the blood against the altar round about. And from the sacrifice of the peace offering, as an offering by fire to the LORD, he shall offer the fat covering the entrails and all the fat that is on the entrails, and the two kidneys with the fat that is on them at the loins, and the appendage of the liver which he shall take away with the kidneys. Then Aaron's sons shall burn it on the altar upon the burnt offering, which is upon the wood on the fire, it is an offering by fire, a pleasing odor to the LORD.¹⁴

¹⁰ Ibid., 4.

¹¹ Ibid., 13.

¹² Rodriguez, 1.

¹³ Lev. 1.3, 3.1, 4.1, and 7.16. All references are taken from the Revised Standard Version unless specified.

¹⁴ Lev. 3.1-5. All references are taken from the RSV.

There are seven basic gestures named in this text. First is **the selection of the victim**. Although there is no description of the actual gesture it must be inferred that the animal is taken by the offerer from the site of the herd to the tent and is presented for sacrifice. Therefore, the second gesture is **the act of presentation** which is the occurrence of bringing the animal to the tent. The third gesture is the touch on the head by the priest or the offerer. The animal is confronted with the intention of the offerer. The third gesture is called **the act of intention**. The fourth gesture is the killing of the animal by the offerer. This is the fourth gesture, and is called **the act of renunciation** in which the offerer gives the sin over to Yahweh. The fifth gesture is the throwing of the blood by the priest around the altar. This gesture is called **the act of linking**, for the sin is linked with Yahweh. The priest then burns the fat, the entrails, the kidneys, and the appendage of the liver. These gestures are called, **the act of reconciliation**, as reconciliation is sought between the offerer and Yahweh. Finally, the **closure of the ritual** is marked with the statement that "it is an offering by fire, a pleasing, odor to the LORD." Some Israelite rituals end with the eating of the victim by either the priest or the offerer or both. Others end with ashes being poured out.¹⁵ It is conceded that the content of the act of closing the ritual may vary according to the type of sacrifice. Nevertheless, the closing of the ritual refers to the gestures performed by the priest or the offerer in relation to the victim.

In the context of this chapter, the term ritual is used to describe overt behavior in a contextual setting: a temple, a tent, in the country, or in the

¹⁵ Lev. 4.12.

city. Ritual will be defined as a sequence of repetitious and/or randomly connected gestures performed by a priest or rapist. Specifically, these events or gestures number seven and include:

1. The selection of the victim, or sacrificial animal.
2. The act of presentation to the priest, or rapist.
3. The act of intention.
4. The act of renunciation.
5. The act of linking.
6. The act of reconciliation.
7. The closure of the ritual.

The rituals vary in rhythm, sequence, and exact content. It will be shown that these gestures are fundamental, and are visibly performed in relationship to the victim in both the rituals of worship and the rituals of rape. Rituals are usually enacted in relationship to a specific deity. In this definition, ritual itself does not include the myth, or the story, which describes the relationship of the victim to the deity. Again, myth is a separate concept and will be discussed fully in the third chapter.

Structure of the Chapter

As previously stated this chapter's thesis is an analogy: the victim of rape is to the rapist what the living animal is to the offerer in ancient near east offerings. The first step in the development of the analogy identifies the seven similar gestures in the Aztec ritual of human female offerings, and the ancient Israelite ritual of animal offerings. This step builds upon the work of Jung and TePaske. Jung develops his theory of transformation symbolism by

comparing the vision of Zoismos, a priest, with the Roman Mass.¹⁶ TePaske builds upon Jung's method by comparing the same Aztec ritual of the human female offerings with rape.¹⁷

In a daringly comparative religious study of the mid-sixteenth century, the Mexican Dominican Fray Diego Duran describes a series of sacrifices of young women to the goddess Chicomecoatl. The treatment of the victims in this ritual context displays in full archaic flower a ritualized form of behavior which Groth and Birnbaum found characteristic of the sadistic rapist, including the cropping of hair, keeping of momentos, washing or cleansing of body, (incense or purification), dressing of the victim in certain ways, forced behavior, cutting and execution, flaying and dismemberment, the religious fantasy and the tendency to appropriate parts or belongings of the victim.¹⁸

TePaske associates rape and ritual using the Aztec offerings of a human female with Groth's description of the sadistic rapist, concentrating the comparison on specific human behaviors.¹⁹ TePaske's original material for this portion of his comparison is the actual observations of Aztec ritual made by sixteenth century Dominican Friar Diego Duran, who writes to inform other Catholic missionaries about the heathenish and idolatrous ways of the Aztecs.²⁰ Duran, himself, makes brief references to the similarities between the ancient Israelite rituals of sacrifice and the human sacrifice.²¹ It is not the intention of this paper to devalue the religious practices of the Aztecs nor the Israelites. The intention is to indicate similarities and differences in the gestures of the rituals.

¹⁶ Jung, "Transformation Symbolism in the Mass," 162-163.

¹⁷ TePaske, 119.

¹⁸ Ibid., 120.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Duran, 70.

²¹ Ibid., 24-25.

The foundation for the second section of this chapter is found in the comparison of the Aztec and Israelite rituals. The rituals of both animal and human female offerings are compared with the rituals of rape described by Groth and Birnbaum.²²

Aztec and Israelite Ritual

The following citation was used by TePaske in his comparison of rape and ritual:

Another slave was dressed and purified to represent the goddess Chicomecoatl. [She was given ornaments, a tiara upon her head, ears of corn on her neck and hands]. She was forced to make merry and dance and was taken from the home of one nobleman to another who had been in sadness, penance, and fasting. To the hair on the crown of this woman's head was tied a vertical green feather, which represented the tassels of the stalks of corn. It was tied with red ribbon, indicating that at the time of this feast the maize was almost ripe but still green.²³

TePaske summarizes the rather lengthy ritual:

A girl twelve or thirteen years old, the most comely to be found, was chosen to represent this goddess. The girl was presented to the goddess, incensed, greeted with trumpets and conch-shell blast, had her hair cropped more closely and was carried by the elders bound to a litter. She was passed through the end of the hall where Huitzilopochtli stood. Her passing through this room was the essence of the ceremony. Blood offering from previous sacrifices were presented to her by the priests.

When the people had gathered, the girl was offered incense again, no less solemnly than on the previous day. Then she was cast upon the piles of ears of corn and seeds and decapitated. Her blood was gathered in a small bowl. And the wooden goddess was sprinkled with it. All the chamber was sprinkled with it, and so were the offerings of ears of corn, chili, squash, seed and vegetable which lay there. After her death she was flayed and one of the priests donned her skin. On it were placed all the garments the girl had worn - her tiara on his head, her ears of corn on his neck and hands. He was presented to the public while the drums sounded and all danced, led by the man dressed in the skin of the young girl and the robes of the goddess.

²² Groth, and Birnbaum, 13.

²³ Duran, 223.

The body of the woman was finally eaten together with those of other sacrificial captives in a feast which curiously enough, was not considered cannibalistic.²⁴

The criterion for the selection of the sacrificial victim is her sex. In this festival the victim must be female.²⁵ She is chosen from among the slaves, so she is the particular property of the slave owner. Then, she is washed and purified for this ritual.²⁶ She is young and "the most comely."

The time for the ritual of renewal is just prior to the harvest on approximately September 16 of each year.²⁷ Huitzilopochtli's temple is the site of the ritual.²⁸

The seven fundamental gestures in this Aztec ritual of renewal are as follows: first, the ritual begins with the selection of the victim of "the most comely girl."²⁹ Second, the act of presentation takes place when the girl is presented to the priest, and he crops her hair. Third, the act of intention is the time when the victim is confronted by the god to whom she is to be sacrificed. Fourth, the girl is linked with previous sacrifices; she is offered their blood. This varies slightly from the Israelite worship. In that ritual the blood is mixed with previous sacrifices by the priest who throws the blood

²⁴ TePaske, 120.

²⁵ Ibid., 119. TePaske says Duran reports that the Aztecs used males in other sacrifices.

²⁶ Duran, 133.

²⁷ Ibid., 223.

²⁸ Ibid., 72. Huitzilopochtli is translated by Duran as the "Lord of all Created Things and the Almighty." A description of this temple may be examined in the second chapter of Duran.

²⁹ Ibid., 120.

around the altar. The Aztec victim drinks the blood, prior to her sacrifice. Incense is burned in relationship to the sacral victim. Sixth, the victim is decapitated, thus she is renounced by the community of offerers. The postmortem or acts of reconciliation include the removal of her blood into a container, and her flayed skin is worn by a priest. Finally, the last gesture, the priest and others who participated in the ritual consume her remains.

The following are selections from the book of Leviticus which describe the ritual of sacrifice involving a female sacrificial animal.

If a man's offering is a sacrifice of peace offering, if he offers an animal from the herd, male or female, he shall offer it without blemish before the Lord. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering and kill it at the door of the tent of the meeting; and Aaron's sons the priests shall throw the blood against the altar round about. And from the sacrifice of the peace offering as an offering by fire to the LORD, he shall offer the fat covering the entrails and all the fat that is on the entrails, and the two kidneys with the fat that is on them at the loins, and appendage of the liver which he shall take away with the kidneys. Then the sons shall burn it on the altar upon the burnt offering, which is upon the wood on the fire; it is an offering by the fire, a pleasing odor to the LORD.³⁰

If any one of the common people sins unwittingly in doing any one of the things which the LORD has commanded not to be done, and guilty, when the sin which he has committed is made known to him he shall bring for his offering a goat, a female without blemish, for his sin which he has committed. And he shall lay his hand on the head of the sin offering, and kill the sin offering and in the place of the burnt offering. And the priest shall take some of its blood with his finger and put it on the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and pour out the rest of its blood at the base of the altar. And all its fat he shall remove, as the fat is removed from the peace offerings, and the priest shall make atonement for him, and he shall be forgiven.

If he brings a lamb as his offering for a sin offering, he shall bring a female without blemish, and lay his hand upon the head of the sin offering, and kill it for a sin offering in the place where they kill the burnt offering. Then the priest shall take some of the blood of the sin offering with his finger and put it on the horns

³⁰ Lev. 3.1-5.

of the altar of burnt offering, and pour out the rest of its blood at the base of the altar. And all its fat he shall remove as the fat of the lamb is removed from the sacrifice of peace offerings, and the priest shall burn it on the altar, upon the offerings by fire to the Lord; and the priest shall make atonement for³¹ him for the sin which he has committed, and he shall be forgiven.

The Lord said to Moses, "Say to the people of Israel, he that offers the sacrifice of his peace offerings to the LORD shall bring his peace offerings to the Lord; from the sacrifice of his peace offerings. He shall bring with his own hands the offerings by fire to the Lord; he shall bring the fat with the breast, that the breast may be waved as a wave offering before the Lord. The priest shall burn³² the fat on the altar, but the breast shall be for Aaron and his sons.

In contrast to the annual Aztec festival, the Israelite rituals are not confined to annual events, but occur as a daily routine on the part of the priest, as the people brought offerings to the Lord.³³ The ritual begins outside the tent which is the meeting place with Yahweh. The living animal is not brought inside the tent. The ritual is terminated when the animal is consumed, then Yahweh's forgiveness is received by the offerer, the sinner.

The selection of the victim according to the passages from Leviticus permits a female to be used in a peace offering, and a female is required for ritual when a common person sins unwittingly against Yahweh. The victim must be unblemished and must be taken from the herd. It must be a possession, not a wild animal.

There are seven fundamental events in the ritual offering to Yahweh as it has been stated. The selection of the unblemished sacrificial animal is the first. Second, the act of presentation takes place when the animal is brought

³¹ Lev. 4.27-35.

³² Lev. 7.28-33.

³³ Lev. 1.2.

to the tent for sacrifice. Third, the act of intention occurs when the priest/offerer touches the animal on the head. The act of renunciation is the killing of the animal. Fifth, the act of linking is the draining of the animal's blood. The blood of the animal is scattered in the presence of the altar where blood from previous sacrifices has been scattered and thus the two are intermingled. The scattering also brings the blood into the presence of Yahweh. Then, as a part of the act of reconciliation, the breast is waved to Yahweh. The entrails and the fat are burned. Seventh, the ritual ends with consumption of those portions by those who are clean, and the priest declares that those offering the sacrifice are forgiven.

The seven sequential events of ritual of the Aztec sacrifice and the Israelite sacrifices fundamentally are similar, even though the sequence varies slightly. In the Aztec ritual the act of intention and the act of linking current sacrifices with previous sacrifices, and the purification by the burning of incense, all precede the death or the act of renunciation of the victim. In the Israelite ritual the death or the sacrifice of the victim precedes the other sequential events of ritual.

The content of the seven events is comparable. First, in the Aztec ritual, the victim must be the most comely young girl in the tribe. The victim in the Levitical ritual, though animal and not human, is also to be unblemished and young. The sex of the victim is relevant in each culture. A female human victim is mandated in this particular Aztec ritual.³⁴ Among the Israelite rituals certain offerings require an unblemished female goat or ewe, while other rituals require an unblemished male. "If anyone of the common

³⁴ TePaske, 119.

people sins unwittingly in doing any one of the things which the Lord has commanded not to be done and is guilty, when the sin which he commits is made known to him he shall bring for his offering a goat, a female without a blemish."³⁵ During the act of presentation the victims are treated similarly in both rituals. The victim in both cases is brought to the site of the ritual. It is at this time that the Aztec priest crops the hair on her head. The head of the animal is touched in the Israelite ritual as the act of intention, for the offerer then identifies himself with the victim. The Aztec binds and ties the victim to a litter and carries her through the hall, where she is offered the blood from previous sacrifices as the act of linking. Their blood links her with previous sacrifices. The Israelite victim is brought into the tent where previous animals are sacrificed. However, neither the victim nor the priest taste the blood. Instead, the blood of the animal is sprinkled, linking the animal with previous sacrifices and with Yahweh. The act of renunciation is the same: both victims are killed. The Aztec victim's head is decapitated, and the Israelite victim's head is ritually touched by the offerer prior to killing. In both cases the blood from each is ceremoniously drained from the corpse. The blood is sprinkled on the participants.

The act of reconciliation in both of the rituals requires the dismemberment and flaying of various body parts. The flayed skin of the Aztec victim is donned by the priest and worn. Entrails and fat are removed from the Israelite corpse and burned in offering for Yahweh. The Aztec victims are consumed in a ritual meal. In Israelite offerings different ritual requires that different body parts be consumed. Some parts are consumed by the priests, others are burned and their ashes are scattered.

³⁵ Lev. 7.8.

It is obvious that though these two rituals are separated by several centuries, cultures, and continents, the two are comparable. The victims may be different: one in a human form of animal life and the other in a nonhuman form of animal life. Nevertheless, the seven gestures which are enacted upon the victim are distinctly similar. The victims are selected based on a specific criterion. The action by the priests indicate which part of the body is considered important to their cultural understanding of the divine. They practice similar ritual acts in the preparation of the victim, the death, the dismemberment, and the consumption of the offering. The two rituals are comparable, both contain an element of violence which is central to the worship. The ritual is closed as the priest declares the forgiveness of Yahweh, or when the victim is consumed.

Victims in the Ritual of Rape

The next step in this analogy is to compare the violent aspect of the Israelite ritual of worship with the ritual of rape.³⁶ TePaske formulates a general parallel between the Aztec ritual and the sadistic ritual of rape using Groth's and Birnbaum's category of sadistic rape.³⁷ However, TePaske does not show a detailed comparison of the two rituals which is the intent of this section. The focus of TePaske's analysis is the ego individuation of the rapist, and the focus of the analogy in this chapter is the victim. Likewise, the intention of Groth and Birnbaum is to develop psychoanalytic categories for a discussion of sexual offenders. They make only casual reference to the method

³⁶ Ancient Israelite worship is the foundation for Christian worship. Underhill, 200.

³⁷ TePaske, 120.

of rapists as being a ritual. Sadistic rapists were especially noted for their ritualistic patterns.³⁸

Groth and Birnbaum formulate three different psychoanalytic categories of rape: **anger**, **power** and **sadistic**. The categories are determined by the different methods or rituals of rape and the different motives. Briefly, an **anger rapist** is noted for his blitz style of attack. He is recognized by his sudden and unprovoked attack, and by his extreme use of force to subdue his victim.³⁹ He receives his satisfaction through the discharge of his anger rather than through sexual gratification.⁴⁰ His victims suffer tremendous physical trauma. The victims report their rape experience as life threatening.⁴¹

From the psychoanalytic perspective, conquest and captivity of the victim through power is the aim of the **power rapist**. This type of rapist may use force to subdue his victim, but he is likely to use verbal threats to capture her. He is characterized by his aggrandizing self image. He wants the victim to reassure him that he is irresistible and in total control: "They can't resist me. They can't reject me. They're going to have no say in the matter. I'm in charge now."⁴² The power rapist may ask the victim if she enjoys the experience and since her life is threatened she may be forced to

³⁸ Groth and Birnbaum, 44.

³⁹ Ibid., 14.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 15.

⁴¹ Ibid., 124.

⁴² Ibid., 43.

respond in the affirmative.⁴³ Subsequent to the rape the survivors report continued feelings of helplessness, blame, and guilt.⁴⁴

The difference between the **sadistic rapist** and the two other rapists is twofold:

[The] assault is deliberate, calculated, and preplanned. The offender takes precautions against discovery, such as wearing a disguise or blindfolding his victim.⁴⁵ The victim is stalked, abducted, abused, and sometimes murdered.⁴⁶

This particular characteristic of the sadistic rapist forms the structural similarity which permits the comparison between the ritual of rape and the ritual of worship. Both have preplanned repeatable structure. Second, the aim of the sadistic rapist may not necessarily be sexual violation by his penis into the vagina of the victim. This offender receives sexual satisfaction and gratification from the various gestures which he performs on his victims. Eric a convicted rapist states,

My intention from the outset was to give my victims an enema and follow it with anal sex; but in most cases I "came off" during the enema without requiring anal entry.⁴⁶

This quotation illustrates the point that the aim of the sadistic rapist is not vaginal penetration of his victim with his penis, but for this rapist is an enema followed by anal intercourse. However, as he describes, he ejaculates without intercourse, and therefore his sexual gratification is received through his gesture of giving his victims an enema. This is not necessarily the end of his ritual. It is important to keep in mind that Groth and Birnbaum are

⁴³ Ibid., 43.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 44.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 45.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 44-45.

suggesting that the aim of the ritual of rape for him, a convicted sexual offender, is not the act of sexual intercourse. According to TePaske, "In rape, 'naive' though such a presumption may be, a certain woman becomes the image of a man's ambivalence, and the victim of his fear."⁴⁷ In the act of rape then, the rapist is able to renounce the image of a woman, and give up his fear, and "shore up his phallic pride."⁴⁸ It is the victim's purpose to serve as a substitute for his image of his own ambivalence. His fear is not renounced, she is substituted, and then she is renounced.

The evidence in the chapter is limited to the rape rituals of the individual rapists Eric and Oliver. The exact content of the ritual patterns are determined by each of these rapists, although Caputi would prefer to suggest that they are repetitions of Jack the Ripper.⁴⁹ For Eric and Oliver, the continuity of the ritual emerges as each rapes again, and again. Certain bizarre gestures bring each satisfaction. The sadistic rapist Oliver states the importance of a ritual or a plan in the following way:

Without a plan, one is likely to botch the job. Cold-blooded murder was always a part of all these plans. Murder is sadistic, and there's no doubt that I planned to be sadistic. The very thought of murder was appealing, even though I don't like to consider murder as evil as rape.⁵⁰

Oliver himself stresses the importance of a plan or ritual. He indicates that he does in fact botch the job when he fails to follow his own plan. In one of his rape attempts, he tells his victim to enter the back seat of the van. He

⁴⁷ TePaske, 80.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 58.

⁴⁹ Caputi, 33-62.

⁵⁰ Groth and Birnbaum, 50.

confronts her with a gun, and using handcuffs from his rape kit, he handcuffs her hands behind her back.⁵¹ At this point Oliver fails to follow his plan. He was suppose to get out of the van while pointing his gun at her, enter the backseat via the passenger door. Once inside, his plan was to handcuff her ankles, and draw her ankles to her hands behind her back using a cord. He says, "Instead, I climbed into the back seat and attempted to do that just by physical force alone."⁵² Oliver declares that he does follow a definite plan, and when he doesn't follow it, he himself realizes that he botches the job.

The following excerpts describe how Oliver chooses his victims in three different rapes:

1. It was set up as an off-the-street kidnapping. I selected a number of victims. I believe it was the fifth or sixth one that chose to walk down a somewhat less than brightly lit street, more deserted than the other had been, better timing--little variables.⁵³
2. I went out looking for a victim. Sometimes I couldn't find one. Other times, I did but managed to avoid doing it. Then the right time, the right place, and the right person a hitchhiker.⁵⁴
3. I found my last victim. She was thumbing a ride, and when I stopped she got into the car.⁵⁵

In each of these rapes, Oliver approaches the victims in his van. He may be parked along the curb, or driving along the street. When his victim gets close enough, he confronts her with his gun.

⁵¹ Ibid., 50. Oliver's rape kit contained a sawed-off shotgun, two pairs of handcuffs, some sections of rope, gags, and a .32 caliber revolver.

⁵² Ibid., 55.

⁵³ Ibid., 50.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 51.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 55.

1. When she got within five feet of the van, I stepped out in front of her, pointed my gun at her and told her to get into the van.⁵⁶
2. I picked her up and then pointed the gun at her and told her not to do anything stupid.⁵⁷
3. Before she could think to undo her seatbelt, I had the gun pointing at her head and said, "Don't!"⁵⁸

Although Oliver's intention is the act of rape, he has said this about the killing and the rape of his victims:

In the first killing, I had an erection up to the point I fired the gun. I have no memory of ever having legitimate, consenting sexual fantasy. Originally, the fantasy associated with my offenses was that sexual intercourse itself would be painful to the victim. After my hospitalization, it was much more the humiliation of than the pain of sex.⁵⁹

From Oliver's description the first action of the rape ritual is the selection of his victim. Although his description does not include the exact details of his physical criteria for his choice of victims, it is obvious that his first criterion is that his victim be female, and the right person a hitchhiker. He does not disclose any other details of his criteria, only that he does experience some sort of screening process prior to the selection of his actual victim.

Oliver's ritual also includes an act of presentation. In each rape he describes how he stops and presents his van: offering his victim a ride.

He confronts (act of intention) her with the intent of his ritual when he

⁵⁶ Ibid., 50.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 51.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 55.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 56.

points his gun at her face. It can be inferred from his description that the victim then realizes that Oliver's intention is something other than just giving her a ride; it is rape.

Oliver's victims are linked (act of linking) with his previous rapes prior to the act of renunciation; he uses the instruments from his rape kit in each of his rapes.

The act of renunciation in Oliver's rape ritual is the murder of each of his victims by gunfire. Although Oliver, himself, reports that rape was more evil than murder; the act of rape remains a part of Oliver's fantasy. According to his own documentation Oliver never actually rapes his victims.

Finally, the acts of reconciliation, and the closure of the ritual are inclusive of each other. Oliver separates himself from his victim and his kit. He reports in each case that he either gets rid of his dead victim or runs away, and that he also gets rid of the rape kit, and the gun.⁶⁰ He does not disclose specific details.

The other sadistic rapist is Eric. During one summer Eric kills four women. In addition to the enemas Eric administers to his dead victims, he also dismembers them into five parts.⁶¹ Then, he flays the breast, and the vagina. Each one sustains multiple stab wounds, and evidence from one postmortem examination indicates that Eric has both vaginal and anal intercourse with his victim after her death.

As my victim's attitude of submission increased, my sexual excitement proportionately increased. I was aware that this excitement derived from the prospect of having a young, pure,

⁶⁰ Groth and Birnbaum, 50, 51, and 56.

⁶¹ Ibid., 45. Groth and Birnbaum's description does not include specific detail of Eric's dismemberment of his victims.

upperclass girl and bringing her down to my level-- a feeling like "Well, there's one fine, fancy bitch who not only got an enema in front of a man but was given it by a man and fucked in the ass besides. And from a freak like me to top it all off! Bet she don't feel so uppity now, contaminated by a crud like me. I had long identified enemas with humiliation."⁶²

In contrast to Oliver, Eric is able to actualize his rape fantasy in his ritual. Since Groth and Birnbaum's study fails to report Eric's self-description of his actions, it is not possible to elicit all the exact details of Eric's rapes. However, it is possible from the postmortems to determine that each of his four victims was a woman.

It cannot be determined how Eric presents himself to his victims. It can be ascertained from his description that he took delight in confronting them. Even he could recognize their attitude of defeat, hopelessness, and submission.

Eric kills each of his victims; no doubt the act of repudiation. He gives enemas to each of them; then he dismembers them into five pieces, and flays their breasts, and their vaginas. Since each of the victims received a postmortem enema, it is likely that this act linked each rape with the other. But it also linked each rape with Eric's own intrapsychic feelings of humiliation, "I had long identified enemas with humiliation."⁶³ Enemas are the symbol of his ambivalence and the part of himself he most wanted to repudiate. The flaying of the breasts and the vagina must lead Eric into the the closure of the ritual. The completion of the enemas seemingly gives Eric a sense of reconciliation within himself as he declares that his victim must not feel so uppity now. There is no extant material available which discloses the

⁶² Ibid., 46.

⁶³ Ibid. As a child he had been ill, and he had received enemas.

exact nature of the closing of the ritual. Nevertheless, given the precise and exact duplication of each rape, it is more than likely that Eric was equally precise and exact as he ended his rape.

Conclusion

The discussion of these somewhat grotesque behaviors shows that victims of rape are to the rapist what the animal of sacrifice is to the offerer. The seven gestures help to draw out this analogy.

The Israelites selected a victim from their herd. The rapist selected a victim. She may not be his physical property, but she is a manifestation of the rapist's intrapsychic conflict and thus his psychological possession. Second, the animal is brought to the temple and presented to the priest; the reverse is true in rape. The rapist must present himself to the victim, and this is often done in a friendly manner, like offering a ride. The act of intention is distinct from the act of presentation. In the former the victim is confronted with the intention of the ritual. The offerer lays hands upon the head of the animal. The rapist may also communicate the intention in a physical way, by using a gun, or positioning himself on top of the supine, or prone victim. The act of linking in both rape and in the ancient sacrificial worship involves the post-mortem manipulation of their flesh and blood. In the ancient sacrificial worship, the act of reconciliation is the pleasurable act of eating the remains of the animal. In rape, the act of reconciliation may also be pleasurable. Eric took delight after having given enemas to his victims: "I have found as much pleasure, if not more, reaching climax with masturbation during the administration of the enemas - sodomy or coitus being

unnecessary."⁶⁴ Closure in the ritual of worship is voiced by the priest praising God's forgiveness. The closure of rape rituals at this point remains a little more ambiguous. The extant evidence presented here shows only that the rapist departs.

Based on these seven similarities it is possible to analogize that the victim of rape is to the rapist what the sacrificial animals are to the priest, and to the person who offers the sacrifice. By demonstrating a clear analogy between the victim of rape and the sacrificial animal, a concrete relationship between the rituals of rape and worship is clearly established within the context of the kingdom of God: Christianity. Yet, rape is considered to be a violent crime, and animal sacrifice is an act of worship. This analogy raises serious questions as to the meaning or the interpretation of these two rituals. Women, treated like animals, raises the theological question: what status do women enjoy in the kingdom of God? The exact nature of that theological question is the discussion of the third chapter which compares the meaning of the myths of the two rapes of the concubine and the daughters of Shiloh in Judges 19, and the meaning of the sacrifices performed by the Levitical priests.

⁶⁴ Groth and Birnbaum, 45.

Chapter 3

Myth

The rituals of rape and the ancient sacrificial worship share similar grotesque, bizarre, and ugly gestures. The way in which the victims are treated in rape and worship involving animal offerings touches the issue of violence and its centrality to worship.¹ If victims can be treated in such ways, then what meaning do they have within the kingdom of God? The ensuing analysis of biblical myths proposes the analogy that the **act of animal sacrifice** is to the offerer what the act of rape is to the rapist.

The Term Myth

Commonly the term myth is used to refer to stories that explain our cosmology or are fictitious, or the term refers to common false assumptions about society.² Biblical texts are not usually called myths. Tribble defines biblical narratives as "stories," and "storytelling is a trinitarian act that

¹ Those gestures are: the act of selection, the act of presentation, the act of intention, the act of sacrifice, the act of linking, the act of reconciliation, and the closure of the ritual.

² This project assumes a relationship between ritual and myth. Some rituals incorporate myths, and some myths describe rituals. One does not supplant or subjugate the other. Rituals enact the eternal struggle by humans for their union with the divine, and myths tell and retell the story of the eternal struggle. For a further discussion of the relationship between ritual and myth see Oliver Edwin James, Christian Myth and Ritual (London: Murray, 1933), and Jane Harrison, Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion (London: Merlin Press, 1980), chapter 6.

unites writer, text, and reader in a collage of understanding."³ Tribble uses the term story as a literary genre.⁴ However, Kerenyi held that "mythology is held to explain itself and everything else in the universe not because it was invented for the purpose of explanation, but because it possesses among other things the property of being explanatory."⁵ Biblical myths are not written for the purpose of explaining rape or worship, but are written to describe Yahweh's relationship with the realm of humans beings. In the process, the explanatory myths of rape and worship emerged. Mythology is lived experience of real people.⁶

Carl Kerenyi states, "Mythology gives a ground, lays a foundation. It does not answer the question 'why' but 'whence.'"⁷ "In mythology the shaping is pictorial. A torrent of mythological pictures streams out."⁸ Judges 19-21 pictorially describes three different acts of rape, just as the book of Leviticus pictorially describes the acts of worship.

³ Tribble, 1.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Carl Jung and Carl Kerenyi, Essays on a Science of Mythology (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1973), 5.

⁶ Bronislaw Malinowski stated it: "The myth in a primitive society, i.e. in its original living form, is not a mere tale told but a reality lived. It is not in the nature of an invention such as we read in our novels today, but living in reality, believed to have occurred in primordial times and to be influencing ever afterwards the world and the destinies of men. . . . These stories are not kept alive by vain curiosity, neither as tales that have been invented nor again as tales that are true. For the natives on the contrary they are the assertion of an original, greater, and more important reality through which the present life, fate, and work of mankind [humankind] are governed, and the knowledge of which provides men [humans] on the one hand with motives for ritual and moral acts, on the other with the direction for their performance." Ibid.

⁷ Ibid., 6.

⁸ Ibid., 3-4.

Joseph Campbell defines myth as functional.⁹ He distinguishes four different essential functions of mythology within the historical context of most societies. First, mythology serves a religious function, providing the reader with the experience of the mystery of the divine and all creation.¹⁰ Second, he states that mythology renders a cosmology.¹¹ Third, mythology tends to support the existing social order.¹² Finally, mythology serves to open the individual to the intrapsychic workings of the individual's own spiritual growth.¹³

From the perspective of analytical psychology, Jung elaborates on the psychological function of the mythology in his theory of the conscious and the unconscious.

⁹ Joseph Campbell, Occidental Mythology, vol. 3 of The Masks of God (New York: Viking, 1964), 519.

¹⁰ "The first and most distinctive - vitalizing all - is that of eliciting and supporting a sense of awe before a mystery of being." Ibid.

¹¹ "The second function of mythology is to render a cosmology, an image of the universe that will support and be supported by this sense of awe before the mystery of a presence and the presence of mystery." Ibid.

¹² "The third function of mythology is to support the current social order, to integrate the individual organically with his [sic] group; and here again, in the long view, we see that a gradual amplification of the scope and content of the group has been the characteristic sign of man's [sic] advance from the early tribal cluster to the modern post-Alexandrian concept of a single world-society." Ibid., 520.

¹³ "The fourth function of mythology is to initiate the individual into the order of realities of his own psyche, guiding him toward his own spiritual enrichment and realization. Formerly--but in archaic cultures still the way was to subordinate an individual judgement, will, and capacities absolutely to the social order; the principle of ego was to be suppressed and if possible, even erased; while the archetype, the ideal roles, of the social order were impressed upon all inexorably, according to their social stations. In a world of static form, such a massacre of the creative personality was acceptable, and where the archaic mind prevails today such patterning still goes on." Ibid., 521.

The primitive mentality does not invent myths, it experiences them. Myths are original revelations of the preconscious psyche, involuntary statements about the unconscious psychic happenings, and anything but allegories of physical processes. Such allegories would be an idle amusement for an unscientific intellect. Myths on the contrary, have vital meaning. Not merely do they represent, they are the psychic life of the primitive tribe, which immediately falls to pieces and decays when it loses its mythological heritage, like a man who has lost his soul. A tribe's mythology is its living religion, whose loss is always and everywhere, even among the civilized, a moral catastrophe. But religion is a vital link with psychic processes independent of and beyond consciousness, in the dark hinterland of the psyche. Many of these unconsciousness processes may be indirectly occasioned by consciousness, but never by conscious choice. Others appear to arise spontaneously, that is to say, from no discernible or demonstrable conscious cause.¹⁴

From a psychological perspective myth serves as a projection. Myths are the reflective response from within our psyche and reflect an image of God and our relationship with God.

Myth in this chapter presumes the aforementioned concepts concerning the function of myth, and includes biblical texts as myths. In light of Campbell's work, myth also includes biblical narratives, because biblical myth also serves the same four functions. Biblical myths are religious. Biblical myths describe the history of the eternal human struggle to be united or in relationship with the divine. Biblical myths support the struggles in the existing social orders as humanity strives for justice. Through the telling and retelling of biblical myths human beings resignify God's presence in human lives. The stories continue to be the material for individual and intrapsychic faith development.¹⁵

A criticism common to most feminists is that biblical narratives or myths

¹⁴ Jung and Kerenyi, 73.

¹⁵ For a discussion of faith development see James Fowler, Stages of Faith (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981).

have been told and largely interpreted from the male perspective which tends to support the early patriarchal societies, and our contemporary patriarchal societies.¹⁶ In order to discern the female perspective of the myth it is necessary to use the traditional tools of exegesis, and historical criticism to construct the role of the female, and her relationship to God in the myth.¹⁷ Specifically, it is necessary to use Fiorenza's hermeneutic of suspicion as the tools of exegesis are implemented. Fiorenza states in her hermeneutic of suspicion that biblical stories represent the oral traditions of the male patriarchs.¹⁸ The female myth can be inferred from the male myths using the traditional tools of exegesis, and Fiorenza's hermeneutic of suspicion. Therefore, this rape myth is examined from the historical, legal and social context of the female.

¹⁶ "The Bible needs to be liberated from its captivity of one-sided, white-class, male interpretation." Letty Russell et al., 12. In this introductory editorial statement, Russell states the problem addressed by the feminist contributors. Fiorenza says it succinctly, "feminist theory insists that all [biblical] texts are products of an androcentric patriarchal culture and history." Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza, In Memory of Her (New York: Crossroad, 1986), xv.

¹⁷ "Critical-historical analysis and a clearly specified commitment serve as the common ground between the academic biblical scholarship and feminist critical theology of liberation." Fiorenza, In Memory of Her, xxiii.

¹⁸ "A feminist critical interpretation begins with a hermeneutic of suspicion rather than a with a hermeneutic of consent and affirmation. It develops a hermeneutic of proclamation rather than a hermeneutic of historical factualness, because the Bible still functions as Holy Scripture in Christian communities today. Rather than reducing the liberating impulse of the Bible to feminist principle or feminist biblical tradition, it develops a hermeneutic of remembrance that moves from biblical texts about women to the reconstruction of women's history. Finally, this model moves from a hermeneutic of disinterested distance to a hermeneutic of creative actualization that involves the church of women in the imaginative articulation of women's biblical story and its ongoing history and community." Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza, Bread Not Stone (Boston: Beacon, 1984), 15. Underlining is used in place of italics in the original.

Structure of the Chapter

Two biblical narratives, Judges 19-21 and sections from Leviticus, are the focus of this chapter's study.¹⁹ The first discussion from the myth in the book of Leviticus illustrates that Yahweh requires his [sic] followers to be in an exclusive covenant with their one LORD Yahweh.²⁰ They are to be obedient to Yahweh's statutes and ordinances. As a part of their worship they are to kill their animals as peace, sin, guilt, and votive offerings, mutilate them, burn or eat them to be in communion with God.

The second discussion will examine the thesis through the context of an early biblical myth which describe the rape of women. Although there are other rape myths recorded in the Bible, Judges 19 -21 records three specific forms of rape in one narrative. This section of Judges unfolds first with the description of the rape of just one woman by the rapist, followed by the expiatory rape of the same woman by more than one rapist, and the story culminates in a corporate act of rape. The purpose of this later discussion is to show that these rapes are enacted to enable the rapist to continue to maintain a righteous relationship with Yahweh, as inheritors of Yahweh's realm, as opposed to acts of lawlessness.

The passage ends with the statement, "In those days there was no king in Israel, every man did what was right in his own eyes."²¹ This sentence

¹⁹ The sections of Leviticus which refer to sacrifice are: Chapters 1-7; 18.1-5; 17; 21.6; and Chapter 22.20-25. These are the primary texts used in this discussion.

²⁰ The use of the term, his in reference does not presume that God is male. The language of the text seems to use male language to describe Yahweh, and therefore the male pronoun is used in reference to Yahweh.

²¹ Judg. 21.25.

raises the question of lawlessness, what is it that men did that is lawless? Tribble argues that the lawlessness occurs when the Levite permits his nameless concubine to be raped, and then he immolates her body into twelve pieces, and sends to each of the twelve tribes of Israel a piece of her body.²² Although this chapter does not negate the terror the unnamed concubine suffers, it does refute Tribble's claim that the Levite acts lawlessly. Quite the contrary, this study shows that the Levite acts as he did in order to maintain his holy relationship with God. Biblical scholars often attribute the last sentence in Judges to an editorial comment by the Deuteronomic historians who assume that all the problems of Israel befell them due to their failure to be obedient to the laws of Yahweh, because there was no King David to lead them.²³ Consequently, the two following discussions demonstrate that the rape and murder of the concubine, and the rape of the daughters of Shiloh like the offering of animals is a righteous act, maintaining the righteousness of the Levite and the males of the tribes of Israel with the divine. So, in this context the rape of women like the offering of animals permits those who rape and those who offer animals to be in righteous relationship with God.

Animal Sacrifice in the Kingdom of God

The book of Leviticus renders a cosmology that brings human beings and their lives under the control of Yahweh, their image of God as the one and only creator:

²² Tribble, 75-77.

²³ James King West, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Macmillan, 1981), 200, 226.

And the Lord said to Moses, "Say to the people of Israel, I am the Lord your God. You shall not do as they do in the land of Egypt, where you dwelt, and you shall not do as they do in the land of Canaan, to which I am bringing you. You shall not walk in their statutes. You shall do my ordinances and keep my statutes and walk in them. I am the LORD your God. You shall therefore keep my statutes and my ordinances, by doing which a man shall live: I am the LORD."²⁴

This pericope describes an exclusive covenant with the people of Israel and Yahweh. Historically, Yahweh is the God who leads his people from Egypt into the land of Canaan. The reference to the exodus is also indicative of the Mosaic covenant.²⁵ The Mosaic covenant defines God's promise to love them, if they love Yahweh and are in exclusive covenant relationship with him. The allusions to the Exodus lead the reader to remember the covenant of the Sinai; but the inclusion of the passage into the Holiness Code focus the attention on the rituals of worship.²⁶ Righteous relationship with the LORD is available to the people by following the statutes and the ordinances of God.²⁷ The ordinances of Yahweh are not limited to, but include the type of animal and the relationship of the animal to its offerer.

You shall not offer anything that has a blemish, for it will not be acceptable for you. And when any one offers a sacrifice of peace offerings to the Lord, to fulfill a vow or as a freewill offering, from the herd or from the flock, to be accepted it must be perfect, there shall be no blemish in it. Animals blind or disabled or mutilated or having discharge or an itch or scabs, you shall not

²⁴ Lev. 18.1-5.

²⁵ James Sanders, Torah and Cannon (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972), 20-28.

²⁶ J.R. Porter, Leviticus (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976), 9. The editors agree that the book "takes for granted the basic covenant of faith of Israel."

²⁷ According to Lev. 7.27, 17.10, 18.29, 19.08, 20.03, 20.05, 20.06, and 22.03, individuals that do not follow the statutes and ordinances of Yahweh would be cut off from their relationship with God.

offer to the LORD or make them an offering by fire upon the altar to the LORD. A bull or lamb which has a part too long or too short you may present for a freewill offering; but for a votive offering it cannot be accepted. Any animal which has its testicles bruised or crushed or torn or cut, you shall not offer to the LORD or sacrifice within your land.²⁸

In the first chapter, the selection of the animal is identified as the first gesture in the ritual of animal sacrifice. The preceding paragraph illuminates the theological rationale, Yaweh demands the very best. The animal is one of the offerer's prize animals, an animal without a blemish. This is an interesting nuance as Rodriguez says that one purpose of the ritual is to identify the individual with the substitute.²⁹ The substitute must be the very best, for evil is transferred from the person to the animal substitute.³⁰

The other six gestures also have a theological significance. In the **act of presentation** the person presents himself or herself as a sinner before the priest seeking atonement from God for the sin.

The **act of intention** or the laying on of hands by the offerer is the moment in the ritual where the animal receives the sins of the individual.³¹ In his discussion of substitution and laying on of hands, Rodriguez proposes that the biblical texts which describe the laying on of hands contain two major concepts:

Namely, transference of some relationship between the subject and the object of ritual. In the expiatory sacrifices what was transferred was sin/impurity. This is clearly the case with the

²⁸ Lev. 22.20-25. See also Lev. 1.03, 1.10, 3.01, 3.06, 4.03, 4.23, 4.28, 4.32, 5.15, 6.06, 9.02, 9.03, 14.10, 22.19, 22.10, 22.25, 23.12, and 23.18.

²⁹ Rodriguez, 74.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid., 193-224.

scapegoat. The ritual of the eating of flesh makes it clear, also, that sin has been transferred to the sacrificial victim. The surprising fact is that such transfer does not affect the holiness of the sacrificial victim. The biblical text maintains on the one hand the holiness of the victim, and on the other hand the transference of sin to it. Both things are true at the same time.³²

After the sacrificial animal receives the sin of the person, then the animal suffers the penalty, death.³³ The death of the animal unites the living offerer with God. Yahweh inhales the aroma of the burning carcass and at the same time returns the living offerer to a righteous relationship with God.

The act of repudiation is the killing of the animal by the offerer. The person renounces his sins, expressing a desire to be in holy relationship with Yahweh. Sin and impurity separate the individual from Yahweh.³⁴ The death of the animal places the sin under the control of Yahweh. Paradoxically, the death of the animal is also recognized as Yahweh's punishment of the offerer. The sacrificial animal that receives the transfer of the sin from the offerer also receives the punishment. Rodriguez concludes in his study that it is:

To the sacrificial victim was transferred the sin/penalty of the offerer and it died as his substitute. In that way the sinner's life was preserved.³⁵

After the death of the animal the priest drains its blood and sprinkles it about the altar. The sprinkling of the blood is the act of linking. This is not limited to a connection with previous victims, but in the Hebrew cultus, it links the victim with its offerer and with Yahweh as well. This act of linking is the heart of the ritual for the myth says, "that by returning the

³² Ibid., 231-232.

³³ Ibid., 40.

³⁴ Ibid., 257.

³⁵ Ibid., 224.

victim's blood to Yahweh through the altar the sinner is allowed to transfer his sin to the presence of the Lord, who only can control it."³⁶ The sin of the offerer, transferred to the animal is now brought under Yahweh's control.

For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it for you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement, by reason of the life. . . . For the life of every creature is the blood of it; therefore I have said to the people of Israel, You shall not eat the blood of any creature, for the life of every creature is its blood; whoever eats it shall be cut off.³⁷

The blood of the animal and the blood of all creatures are from the creator Lord. Hence all creatures are united with God because their blood comes from God. The divine source of human and animal blood is a relevant intrapsychic understanding for the offerers and their belief that the sin could be transferred to the animal. Human and animal blood may not be the same, but both receive their blood from the LORD. Therefore, it is possible for the offerer to believe, that the blood of the animal could carry the sins of the individual to their common creator Yahweh, and that the animal could suffer the punishment as well.

All recognize that the sins have been repudiated by both the offerer and by God. It is time for reconciliation. The biblical myth explicitly describes the theological reason for the flaying of the animal, one of the reconciliatory gestures.

As an offering by fire to the LORD he [the priest] shall offer its fat, the fat tail entire, taking it away close by the backbone, and the fat that covers the entrails, and all the fat that is on the entrails, and the two kidneys with the fat that is on them at the loins, and the appendage of the liver which he shall take away

³⁶ Ibid., 255.

³⁷ Lev. 17.11, 14.

with the kidneys.³⁸ And the priest shall burn it on the altar as food offered by fire.

"Its [Communion Sacrifice's] characteristic feature is that the victim is immolated, and that it is shared among God, the priest, and the offerer."³⁹ The flaying of the animal and the disposition of its body parts by burning it and eating it make possible the unity or communion of the offerer, and the priest, with Yahweh. "All who are clean may eat flesh" refers directly to the inclusion of all the people (who are clean) in the sacrifice of the animal.⁴⁰ All are in communion with the LORD, because all participated in the eating of the flayed animal. Communion with God also comes through the burning of the sacrifice. The burning of the animal brought a "pleasing odor to the LORD."⁴¹ The odor which is pleasing to the LORD is also experienced by the person offering the sacrifice, the priest, and frequently by the entire community of faith.

Rodriguez states that, "a study of the blood and flesh manipulation of the expiatory sacrifices reveals that through the ritual of eating of flesh and through the blood manipulation sin is transferred to the sanctuary and brought under the controlling power of Yahweh. The result was the cleansing of the sinner and the 'contamination' of the sanctuary."⁴²

³⁸ Lev. 3.9b-11.

³⁹ DeVaux, 331.

⁴⁰ Lev. 6.19.

⁴¹ Lev. 1.9, 1.13, and 1.17.

⁴² Rodrigue, 258.

So far, the discussion demonstrates the religious function of the biblical myth by showing that the animal of sacrifice is relevant to the offerer's relationship with Yahweh. The animal symbolizes the union of the human with the divine. Both humans and animals receive their blood from God. The animal assumes an important relationship with the human as his substitute. The animal receives both the sin and the punishment of the offerer, and enables the sinner to continue in a living relationship with God. According to the myth the odor from the burning animal is experienced by both the Creator and the human. Therefore, through the animal, the offerer is able to be in union or communion with God and receive the gifts of peace, atonement, and forgiveness.

Rape in the Kingdom of God

Although there are other myths about rape recorded in the Bible, the ensuing discussion is limited to the book of Judges 19-21. There, three distinct forms of rape are described. Judges 19.1-10 describes what is considered analogous with Groth's and Birnbaum's description of a power rapist.⁴³ The second rape has been defined by Fortune as an expiatory rape, and is described in Judges 19.11-30.⁴⁴ The third act of rape in Judges, Chapter 20, describes the motivation and gruesome details of a gang rape of many women.⁴⁵ As Judges is compiled from fundamentally the same sources as

⁴³ Groth and Birnbaum, 25-44.

⁴⁴ Fortune, 48-50. "In accepting the concubine, the gang was indirectly assaulting the guest." Fortune indicates that the concubine is substituted for the Levite.

⁴⁵ "However, one of the unique dynamics in gang rape is the experience of rapport, fellowship, and cooperation with co-offenders. The offender is not only interacting with the victim, he is also interacting with his co-offenders." Groth and Birnbaum, 115.

Leviticus, it would be somewhat superfluous to describe the cosmology, and the patriarchal society. Therefore, the argument will largely discuss the parallels between the act of rape and the rapist's righteous, and normative relationship with God.

The First Rape Myth

The first rape myth is found in Judges 19.1-10:

In those days, when there was no king in Israel, a certain Levite was sojourning in the remote parts of the hill country of Ephraim, who took to himself a concubine from Bethlehem in Judah. 2 And his concubine became angry with him, and she went away from him to her father's house at Bethlehem in Judah, and was there some four months. 3 Then her husband arose and went after her, to speak kindly to her and bring her back. He had with him his servants and a couple of asses. And he came to her father's house; and when the girl's father saw him, he came with joy to meet him. 4 And his father-in-law, the girl's father, made him stay, and he remained with him three days; so they ate and drank, and lodged there. 5 And on the fourth day they arose early in the morning, and he prepared to go; but the girl's father said to his son-in-law, "Strengthen your heart with a morsel of bread, and after that you may go." 6 So the two men sat and ate and drank together; and the girl's father said to the man, "Be pleased to spend the night, and let your heart be merry." 7 And when the man rose up to go, his father-in-law urged him, till he lodged there again. 8 And on the fifth day he arose early in the morning to depart; the girl's father said, "Strengthen your heart, and tarry until the day declines." So they ate, both of them. 9 And when the man and his concubine rose up to depart, his father-in-law, the girl's father, said to him, "Behold, now the day has waned toward evening; pray tarry all night. Behold, the day draws to its close; lodge here and let your heart be merry; and tomorrow you shall arise early in the morning for your journey, and go home."

10 But the man would not spend the night, he rose up and departed, and arrived opposite Jebus (that is, Jerusalem). He had with him a couple of saddled asses, and his concubine was with him.

This narrative section is not usually considered a rape myth. It is usually considered a simple story about a Levite who took a woman for his concubine. The opening statement indicates that a violation of the woman takes place:

In those days, when there was no king in Israel, a certain Levite

was sojourning in the remote parts of the hill country of Ephraim, who took to himself a concubine from Bethlehem in Judah.⁴⁶

The reader is informed that the Levite assumes legal possession of the woman. She changes from one legal status to another, by a means other than a betrothal. She responds to him. "And his concubine became angry with him, and she went away from him to her father's house at Bethlehem."⁴⁷ The reason for the concubine's departure seems to evade the patriarchal perspective of both James Martin and Robert Boling. Martin says the reason for her departure seems to have been some passing quarrel which is fairly easily resolved.⁴⁸ Such thinking is evidence for the need of Fiorenza's hermeneutic of suspicion. There is no indication of any type of a "passing quarrel." Martin seems to consider that a quarrel which is fairly easily resolved is one that causes the concubine to flee home, the Levite waits alone for a period of time, then pursues, and remains for five days with the father-in-law. Martin fails to note that during that five days there is no mention made of the concubine's presence. Likewise Boling resolves her anger from the perspective of the male, saying, "but it is strange that the woman . . . ran home."⁴⁹ Boling indicts the woman, calling her an "adulteress by walking out on him."⁵⁰ Then, Boling reverses himself by saying that the "Levite's concern to recover his concubine suggests that she, not he, is the offended party."

⁴⁶ Judg. 19.1.

⁴⁷ Judg. 19.2c.

⁴⁸ James Martin, The Book of Judges (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1973), 200.

⁴⁹ Robert Boling, Judges (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), 273.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 274.

Boling adds, "that since he [the Levite] will seek a reconciliation, it should evoke the reader's respect for the Levite at the outset of the story."⁵¹ Martin agrees saying, "The fact that the husband [Levite] goes after her to bring her back suggests that he might have been in the wrong."⁵² Boling and Martin both agree that the text shows that the Levite commits an offense against the woman, although they make no attempt to understand it from the perspective of the woman. In fact the intonation of their writing tends to ignore this aspect as they admonish their readers to not puzzle over his offense but to admire his attempt to reconcile. Clearly, they fail to examine the problem from the perspective of the offended in two ways: first by examining her legal status, and second by answering the question, why did the concubine return to her father? Fiorenza's hermeneutic of suspicion insists on such questions.⁵³ When this pericope is examined in the light of the social and legal context of an ancient Israelite woman's life, and the authority males had in her life, the only logical conclusion was legal rape. The seizure of a woman for a concubine is rape, then a legalized method of securing a wife.

At that particular time in history rape was a legal means of taking a wife. It was one of the two options described in Deuteronomy 22:25-29:

1. But if in the open country a man meets a young woman who is betrothed, and the man seized her and lies with her, then only the man who lay with her shall die. But to the young woman you shall do nothing; in the young woman there is no offense punishable by death, for this case is like that of a man attacking and murdering his neighbor; because he came upon her in the open country, and though the betrothed young woman cried for help there was no one to rescue her.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Martin, 200.

⁵³ Fiorenza, 15-16.

2. If a man meets a virgin who is not betrothed, and seized her and lies with her, and they are found, then the man who lay with her shall give to the father of the young woman fifty shekels of silver, and she shall be his wife, because he has violated her; he may not put her away all his days.

Legally, rape includes several criteria. In the first law the female must be out in the open country. In the second situation, it might be argued that such seizure is not limited to the open country, because it does not specifically make mention of the location. The emphasis seems to be on reparation to the father by the rapist.

The second criterion in these laws is the marital status of the woman. Her status determines which law is applicable. If she is betrothed, then she was subject to the first law. If she is unbetrothed, then she was subject to the second law.

The final consideration of these laws is the consequences to the perpetrator. According to the first law, the rapist is executed. According to the second law, the rapist pays a fine or reparation to the father, and takes the woman for his lifelong wife.

These laws have an impact on the reader's understanding of the narratives; clearly there is the possibility of rape. The narrative tends to support the existing patriarchal society. First, the rape took place in the open country, the hill country of Ephraim.⁵⁴ The biblical myth informs the reader that the Levite is sojourning in the remote parts of the hills of Ephraim. It is there that he takes a woman as his concubine, she is from Bethlehem in Judah. That description allows the reader to imagine that the woman is taken out in the open country, because it doesn't say that he is in Bethlehem the town where she lives.

⁵⁴ Judg. 19.1.

Second, it is possible to infer from the law according to Deuteronomy and the patriarchal society that the woman has no legal voice other than through either her father, or her husband. In this case her father is her caretaker, and it is he who could authenticate her marital status as unbetrothed. He so indicates her unbetrothed status when he came with joy to greet the Levite. If she had been betrothed, then the Levite would have been put to death.⁵⁵ Third, the rapist has to pay a fine to the father. Although the text makes no specific reference to the payment of the fine, the lengthy stay of the Levite (five days) suggests the father and the Levite might have negotiated a settlement. According to later rabbinic literature negotiations were a common practice. "While the fine paid by the man to compensate the father for the financial loss is set at fifty shekels, the fines for indignity, blemish and pain are determined by the father himself."⁵⁶ The society begins to differentiate between a seducer and a rapist. The financial settlement is based on the damages received by the victim. The negotiation of a settlement might be as lengthy as five days.

Personal dignity for the **Shulhan Arukh** is a function of wealth, social status, power, and reputation. This is not surprising: in a hierarchical, rather than democratic society, personal integrity is not equal for all, but rather reflects one's class, lineage, and wealth. Traditional Jewish Society was hierarchical.⁵⁷

Since the girl is the property of her father, only her father could negotiate with the Levite. Her father is legally responsible until he gives her in

⁵⁵ Judg. 19.3c.

⁵⁶ Rachel Biale, Women and Jewish Law (New York: Schocken, 1984), 245.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 245.

marriage. Indeed, the narrative reports that it is the girl's father who eats and drinks with the Levite.

And his father-in-law, the girls' father, made him stay, and he remained with him three days; so they ate and drank, and lodged there. And on the morning of the fourth day they arose early in the morning, and he prepared to go; but the girl's father said to his son-in-law, "Strengthen your heart with a morsel of bread, and after that you may go." So the two men sat and ate and drank together; and the girl's father said to the man, "Be pleased to spend the night, and let your heart be merry."⁵⁸

The text makes no mention of the girl's presence at the banquets, there is no reason to assume that she is included. The father and the Levite eat and drink for several days. In fact, the narrative describes the Levite's unsuccessful efforts to leave each day, but the father-in-law prevents him from leaving. Furthermore, in each case the narrative depicts the Levite's intention to leave unaccompanied. However, the Levite's first attempt to leave with his concubine is not reported until the fifth day. "And on the fifth day he arose early in the morning. . . . And when the man and his concubine and his servant rose up to depart."⁵⁹ At last, the father and the Levite settle their differences, and now the two, the concubine, and the Levite, can depart. Finally, the woman is to be his wife, and "he shall not put her away all his days."⁶⁰

By examining this pericope from the legal and social perspective of the victim, it is argued that Judges 19: 1-10 is a rape myth: the Levite seizes and rapes her in the open country. The girl returns to her father. The Levite follows, and her father declares her marital status to be unbetrothed. Then,

⁵⁸ Judg. 19.4-6.

⁵⁹ Judg. 19. 8a, and 9a.

⁶⁰ Deut. 22.29c

the Levite comes to the father, seeking this unbetrothed virgin from her father. Finally, the Levite takes his concubine as his wife whom he could not put away.

The purpose of this chapter is to elicit the meaning of the act of rape to the rapist, and the meaning of the act of worship to the offerer. The earlier discussion in this chapter shows that the animal is used to return the offerer to a holy or righteous state with God. Likewise, the Levite uses the girl to obtain a wife, a righteous and holy state for a priest. According to the code of ordination, the Levite has to maintain his holy relationship with God.⁶¹ The code requires that he bring to his people a virgin. "They shall not marry a harlot or a woman who has been defiled; neither shall they marry a woman divorced from her husband; for the priest is holy to his God."⁶² The Levite, as a priest, has to be in holy relationship with Yahweh, and therefore he has to assume ownership of the woman. As he has no legal options, he is compelled to go to the father and seek the custody of his wife. If he does not obey the law, then he is considered unclean and unable to enter the tent of worship. He determines the legal status of the girl, by contacting the girl's father, to determine whether or not she was a virgin. The Levite, as a priest, has to be in a holy relationship with Yahweh, and therefore he accepts the legal ownership of the girl as his concubine.

This myth points toward the origins and roots of rape within the kingdom of God. Rape is both legal and maintains holiness with God. It is the history of the subjugation of women to the legal authority of their fathers

⁶¹ Lev., 21.

⁶² Lev., 21.7.

and/or brothers, or spouses. The violations and impact of such a rape on the victim is ignored, just as the life of the animal is ignored when it is killed in worship.

No mention is made of the woman's relationship with God either in the biblical text or in the aforementioned commentaries. It can only be inferred as Brooten has stated, that the wife or concubine must also follow the Yahweh's laws of purity so that her priestly husband might continue to be holy to his God.⁶³ In the Levite's patriarchal society, and for the sake of the priest, it is her duty to conform to the laws of Yahweh. So, when the unnamed concubine is seized, her one recourse is to "run home" to her father who can substantiate her marital status and establish the price for the pain she had endured. Since she is angry, one might assume that her pain is severe. After the payment of reparation the concubine can return with the Levite to his home and live with him all the days of her life, like it or not. According to the narrative, that is what happened. Her actions enable her to be in holy relationship with God through her union with him. This form of rape is in accordance with the Deuteronomic laws of Yahweh. The Levite's righteousness or union with God is found only in the reconciliation of their difference and their union with each other. The concubine's righteousness is subsumed into his righteousness.

The Second Rape Myth

According to Judges 19: 14-30 the second rape, an expiatory rape describing both the sin of a Levite, and the men of the town begins as the first rape myth ends.

⁶³ Brooten, 7.

14 So they passed on and went their way; and the sun went down on them near Gibeah, which belongs to Benjamin, 15 and they turned aside there, to go in and spend the night at Gibeah. And he went in and sat down in the open square of the city; for no man took them into his house to spend the night. 16 And behold, an old man was coming from his work in the field at evening; the man was from the hill country of Ephraim, and he was sojourning in Gibeah; the men of the place were Benjaminites. 17 And he lifted up his eyes, and saw the wayfarer in the open square of the city; and the old man said, "Where are you going and whence do you come?" 18 And he said to him, "We are passing from Bethlehem in Judah to the remote parts of the hill country of Ephraim, from which I come. I went to Bethlehem in Judah; and I am going to my home, and nobody takes me into his house. 19 We have straw and provender for our asses, with bread and wine for me and your maidservant and the young man with your servants; there is no lack of anything." 20 And the old man said, "Peace be to you; I will care for all your wants; only, do not spend the night in the square." 21 So he brought him into his house, and gave the asses provender; and they washed their feet, and ate and drank.

22 As they were making their hearts merry, behold, the men of the city, base fellows, beset the house round about, beating on the door; and they said to the old man, the master of the house, "Bring out the man who came into your house, that we may know him." 23 And the man, the master of the house, went out to them and said to them, "No, my brethren, do not act so wickedly; seeing that this man has come into my house, do not do this vile thing. 24 Behold, here are my virgin daughter and his concubine; let me bring them out now. Ravish them and do with them what seems good to you; but against this man do not do so vile a thing." 25 But the men would not listen to him. So the man seized his concubine and put her out to them, and they knew her, and abused her all night until the morning. And as the dawn began to break, they let her go. 26 And as the morning appeared, the woman came and fell down at the door of the man's house where her master was, till it was light.

27 And her master rose up in the morning, and when he opened the doors of the house and went out to go on his way, behold, there was his concubine lying at the door of the house, with her hands on the threshold. 28 He said to her, "Get up, let us be going." But there was no answer. Then he put her upon the ass; and the man rose up and went away to his home. 29 And when he entered his house, he took a knife, and laying hold of his concubine he divided her, limb by limb, into twelve pieces, and sent her throughout all the territory of Israel. 30 And all who saw it said, "Such a thing has never happened or been seen from the day that the people of Israel came up out of the land of Egypt until this day; consider it, take counsel, and speak."

As the Levite and his concubine are returning home, they stop for the night in Gibeah. Men from the town come to the place where they are staying and demand that the Levite come out so that they might sodomize him. The Levite takes his concubine and forces her outside with them. They rape her and abuse her all night long and do not stop until morning. She crawls home, most likely dead, as she does not respond to the Levite's directions to get up. He takes her home, and there he cuts her into twelve parts and sends the pieces to the twelve tribes of Israel. The tribes respond by saying, "Such a thing has never happened or been seen from the day that the people of Israel came up out of the land of Egypt until this day; consider it, take counsel, and speak."⁶⁴

Some twentieth century minds might not only abhor the actions of the gang, but also the Levite. How could the Levite offer his woman to be raped! The Levite takes his concubine and gives her to them to be raped; it is the same as offering an animal in substitution, or expiation for himself. A Levite knows consciously the laws of Yahweh. Leviticus 21 states that God tells Moses to tell the priests and the sons of Aaron that "none of them shall defile himself." It is assumed that the Levite was conscious of this law, and his consciousness of the laws means that he knows that if he permits himself to be sodomized by the men, then unwittingly he commits a sin.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ Lev. 19.22-30.

⁶⁵ Rodriguez, 78. Rodriguez's dissertation on sacrifice indicated that a sin committed unwittingly required a consciousness of the sinful act, regardless of the subjective state of the individual. Alberto Green, The Role of Human Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975), 90-91. Green's interpretation of "unwittingly" leads to the understanding that if the Levite permits himself to be sodomized against his will, he, conscious that it is a sin, would have been put to death.

In saving his own life and body from the threat of sodomy, the Levite performs the actions necessary to expiate the sin and guilt from himself onto her. As he seizes her to present her to the men of the city, it is reasonable to assume that he uses his hands. By placing or laying his hands onto her, unwittingly his sin is transferred to the concubine in the way an animal receives the sin. She is substituted for his unwitting crime against God in just the same way any sin offering is substituted.⁶⁶ The difference between the animal and the concubine is that the animal does not usually commit the sin, it merely receives the sin in the expiatory rituals. Unlike the animal in this case, the woman lives the sin as well, she experiences his rape. Like the animal, she also pays the penalty for his crime, she is killed. Rodriguez says "that only through the death of a substitute could a man achieve communion with the Lord or be accepted into His presence."⁶⁷ Consequently, the rape and death of the concubine liberates the priest from any crime against God.

The ritual of expiation continues as "he entered his house, he took a knife, and laying hold of his concubine, he divided her, limb by limb, into twelve pieces, and sent her throughout all the territory of Israel."⁶⁸ His immolation of her body and his distribution of her body parts among the twelve tribes of Israel is crucial to understanding the expiation. It is mindful of the descriptions of animal sacrifices. It is reasonable to assume that the Levite drains the blood from her body, and ritualistically presents it to Yahweh. Draining the blood of any animal is the law of Yahweh. If he should

⁶⁶ Rodriguez, 231-232.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 231.

⁶⁸ Judg. 19.29.

fail to comply then he is cut off from Yahweh.⁶⁹ The sprinkling of blood brings the sin under Yahweh's control.⁷⁰ The act of distributing her body parts is analogous to the act of the priest removing the animal of sacrifice out of the tent before all the tribes of Israel. "If it is the anointed priest who sins, thus bringing guilt on the people. . . . The whole bull he [priest] will carry forth outside the camp to a clean place."⁷¹ As the sprinkling of blood brings the sin under the control of Yahweh, in this situation, the distribution of her body brings the sin under the control of Yahweh's people. It is necessary for the people to have control, for as they state in reference to the sin of the Levite, "Such a thing has never happened or been seen from the day that the people of Israel came out of the land of Egypt until this day; consider it, take counsel, and speak."⁷² The people of course are either unaware of, or ignore the priest's sin as they place guilt onto the gang who raped the concubine of the priest.

Rape is not the term the people would have chosen, adultery then, is the term of preference. Biale suggests there is no term to define the rape of a married woman.⁷³ So, "if a man commits adultery with the wife of his neighbor, both the adulterer and the adulteress shall be put to death."⁷⁴ The

⁶⁹ Lev. 7.26-27.

⁷⁰ Rodriguez, 255, 259. Rodriguez suggests that the blood contains the sin, and it is returned to Yahweh so that Yahweh can transform the sin and cleanse the sinner.

⁷¹ Lev. 4.03, and 4.12.

⁷² Judg. 19.30.

⁷³ Biale, 241.

⁷⁴ Lev. 20.10.

gang commits adultery with the wife of the priest, and the wife willingly or unwillingly commits adultery. Even though the woman's complicity in the rape may have been considered unwitting, she remains guilty of a sin against God and the Levite.⁷⁵ The concubine, now adulteress, cannot offer an animal for her sin. She is the animal, and she is already punished. She is already dead. According to the myth the people are called to maintain the social order, and put the "men of the city" to death.

The Third Rape Myth

The tribes of Israel respond to the crime against the Levite with a lengthy war.⁷⁶ The Eleven tribes of Israel wage war against all the Benjaminites in punishment for their crime against God by the rape and murder of the Levite's concubine. The Benjaminite women and children are all killed, few men remain alive, thus creating the situation from which the third rape myth emerges in Judges 21.

Now the men of Israel had sworn at Mizpah, "No one of us shall give his daughter in marriage to Benjamin." 2 And the people came to Bethel, and sat there till evening before God, and they lifted up their voices and wept bitterly. 3 And they said, "O LORD, the God of Israel, why has this come to pass in Israel, that there should be today one tribe lacking in Israel?" 4 And on the morrow the people rose early, and built there an altar, and offered burnt offerings and peace offerings. 5 And the people of Israel said, "Which of the tribes of Israel did not come up in the assembly to the Lord?" For they had taken a great oath concerning him who did not come up to the LORD to Mizpah, saying, "He shall be put to death." 6 And the people of Israel had compassion for Benjamin their brother, and said, "One tribe is cut off from Israel this day. 7 What shall we do for wives for those who are left, since we have sworn by the LORD that we will not give them any of our daughters for wives?"

⁷⁵ Lev. 4.02.

⁷⁶ Judg. 20.8-48.

8 And they said, "What one is there of the tribes of Israel that did not come up to the LORD to Mizpah?" And behold, no one had come to the camp from Jabeshgilead, to the assembly. 9 For when the people were mustered, behold, not one of the inhabitants of the Jabeshgilead was there. 10 So the congregation sent thither twelve thousand of their bravest men, and commanded them, "Go and smite the inhabitants of Jabeshgilead with the edge of the sword also the women and the little ones. 11 This is what you shall do; every male and every woman that has lain with a male you shall utterly destroy." 12 And they found among the inhabitants of Jabeshgilead four hundred young virgins who had not known man by lying with him; and they brought them to the camp as Shiloh, which is in the land of Canaan.

13 Then the whole congregation sent word to the Benjaminites who were at the rock of Rimmon, and proclaimed peace to them. 14 And Benjamin returned at that time; and they gave them the women who they had saved alive of the women of Jabeshgilead; but they did not suffice for them. 15 And the people had compassion for Benjamin because the LORD had made a breach in the tribes of Israel.

16 Then the elders of the congregation said, "What shall we do for wives for those who are left, since the women are destroyed out of Benjamin?" 17 And they said, "There must be an inheritance for the survivors of Benjamin, that a tribe be not blotted out from Israel. 18 Yet we cannot give them wives of our daughters." For the people of Israel had sworn, "Cursed be he who gives a wife to Benjamin." 19 So they said, "Behold, there is the yearly feast of the LORD at Shiloh, which is north of Bethel, on the east of the highway that goes up from Bethel to Sechem, and south of Lebonah." 20 And they commanded the Benjaminites, saying, "Go and lie in wait in vineyards, 21 and watch; if the daughters of Shiloh come out to dance in the dances, then come out of the vineyard and seize each man his wife from the daughters of Shiloh, and go to the land of Benjamin. 22 And when their fathers or their brothers come to complain to us, we will say to them, 'Grant them graciously to us; because we did not take for each man of them his wife in battle, neither did you give them to them, else you would now be guilty.'" 23 And the Benjaminites did so, and took their wives, according to their number, from the dancers whom they carried off; then they went and returned to their inheritance, and rebuilt the towns, and dwelt in them. 24 And the people of Israel departed from there at that time, every man to his tribe and family, and they went out from there every man to his inheritance. 25 In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did what was right in his own eyes.

The third rape myth begins with the words, "Now the men of Israel had sworn

at Mizpah, 'No one of us shall give his daughter in marriage to Benjamin.'"⁷⁷

The problem for the Israelites is: their agreement is a breach in the covenant made with Yahweh. Yahweh is the Sovereign over all twelve tribes of Israel. The twelfth tribe of Israel, the tribe of Benjamin, faces extinction. The patriarchs of the other tribes agree that because of their covenant with Yahweh, the Benjaminites cannot be extinguished from the face of the earth. However, these fathers are bound by their oath at Mizpah and not permitted to give their daughters as wives. The solution to the problem is once again the rape law of Deuteronomy. A man has legal permission to seize, rape, and kidnap an unbetrothed virgin, if he meets her in the open country. So, the tribal leaders solve their problem; they direct the men of Benjamin to employ this law. They are to go and wait in the country for the agricultural festival. At that time, the daughters of Shiloh come out into the country to dance at the harvest. The men can then seize them. The Benjaminites are also directed to tell the fathers and the brothers of the daughters of Shiloh that by raping these women, the fathers and brothers would not be guilty of breaking their oath at Mizpah.⁷⁸ The men of Benjamin have wives and can continue to be in righteous relationship and communion with Yahweh through their heirs.

The narrative in Judges 21 is comparable with the first rape myth which began this discussion. The same law legalizes the rape. However, the situation has different implications. The first rape describes the act of one holy man's compulsion to take ownership of a woman in order to maintain

⁷⁷ Judg. 21.1.

⁷⁸ Judges 21.

holy relationship with God. The second rape implies obedience to the statutes and the ordinances of Yahweh. The third rape implies the fulfillment of divine/human covenant. The covenant that the twelve tribes of Israel will always have heirs. So, the covenant with God is fulfilled by raping women which provide heirs for Yahweh's kingdom.

Conclusion

The thesis of this chapter is: **the act of animal sacrifice is to the offerer what the act of rape is to the rapist.** The animals of the biblical myths are substituted and used to atone for the sins of the offerer, and are consumed as a sign of reconciliation and renewal of righteous relationship or union with God. The victim of rape is used to secure a wife, atone for sins, and provide heirs for the kingdom of God. Each of these secures a union with God. The rape of these women does not violate the laws of Yahweh.

In accordance with the Yahweh's sovereignty over the people of Israel; the Levitic code describes the types of animals which are to be used in sacrifice. Likewise, Yahweh's Deuteronomic code differentiates between legal and illegal acts of rape. Rape is largely a legal method for obtaining a wife and legal heirs to Yahweh's kingdom. The exclusive image of a male Yahweh, reflects the patriarchal society. Consequently, the laws of Yahweh socially and culturally oppressed women. The notion that women are of equal value to God, or God desires to be in direct covenant with women, or that women might respond with a desire to be in a direct covenant with God is repressed into the unconscious of our human psyche.

The myths show that the patriarchal structure of the society establishes the same bonds between the offerer and the animal and the rapist (Levite) and his victim (the concubine): the bond of ownership. The bond permits the rapist to transfer sin to the concubine, and then to receive forgiveness in

the same way the offerer transfers his sin to the animal and then receives forgiveness. This is yet another perspective on the centrality of violence to worship. Neither the violence, nor the subjugation of one sex to another, is considered to be a sin. Rather, violence and subjugation within the existing social structure are seen as necessary in order to be in righteous relationship with God.

A question which remains to be answered is why is there a perpetuation and increase in the incidence of reported rape, while in contrast, Christianity has replaced the heinous death of an animal with the intrapsychic and interpsychic Self as the sacrificer and the sacrificed.⁷⁹

The exclusive image of the male God Yahweh reflects the patriarchal society. Consequently, the laws of Yahweh socially and culturally were interpreted to oppress women. The notion that women like men are of the same value to God, or that women need and are desired to be in direct covenant with God, is repressed into the unconscious of the human psyche. Apparently both women and men view the female's relationship with Yahweh as largely dependent upon her father's, brothers', or spouse's relationship with Yahweh. Clearly, in this ancient kingdom of God described in Judges, rape is not viewed as the evil act which we see it today, it is equivalent with the sacrifice of the animals. Rape permits the rapist to maintain a righteous relation with God just as the sacrifice of animals permits the offerer to maintain a righteous relations with God. Today some of us understand both the psychological harm as well as the physical harm to both the rapist and the victim of rape. Rape is not a process which permits the union of opposites

⁷⁹Jung, "Transformation Symbolism in the Mass," 157.

(male and female) with the divine, but it is a process which prevents this process. Rape subjugates the power of the female to the power of the male. If rape subjugates the power of the female rendering her into a state of helplessness, then all human beings are subjugated by an all powerful patriarchal male image of God. If humanity oppresses and subjugates other humans, then such actions also restrict and subjugate the human relationship with the divine.

Chapter 4

Sacrifice

The previous two chapters declare the violence of rape is related to the violence of animal offerings in two ways. First, both rituals are formed from similar terrorizing, and violent gestures. Second, the myths associated with each of these rituals show that the rituals serve similar functions. The animal is sacrificed to bring the offerer into righteous relationship with God. Likewise, the Levite rapes a woman to obtain a wife, the Levite offers his concubine as a means to atone for his sin, and the Benjaminites gang rape the daughters of Shiloh to obtain wives who will provide heirs to their divine inheritance. Furthermore, these myths lay the foundation for the intrapsychic development, and socialization of the readers. Neither the men nor women portrayed in the myths perceive a woman to be a free individual who can be in direct relationship with God. On the contrary, a woman's righteousness depends upon the righteousness of her spouse.

The preceding two chapters focus on the violent treatment of humans by other humans, and the biblical understanding that such treatment is in keeping with God's holy ordinances. This raises the theological question, does God require sacrifice and sacrificial substitutes for atonement, and does God require the subjugation of females for male righteousness? Are women denied sacrifice? Are males alone permitted righteousness in the eyes of God?

The focus of this chapter is the sacrifice of Jesus, Mary, and God. The sacrifice of Jesus in the act of crucifixion represents the total self-giving of a man's life to be in union with the divine. Crucifixion is the method of

sacrifice, and there is little question that this ritual is an act of violence. It is the ultimate sacrifice of God's incarnation. Therefore, the thesis of this chapter is that the **crucifixion is to Jesus what the annunciation is to Mary.** This analogy examines both the sacrifice of the human to the divine, and the sacrifice of the human by the divine. Jesus sacrifices himself and is sacrificed by God in the act of crucifixion as Mary sacrifices herself and is sacrificed by God in the act of rape.

The idea of the rape of Mary, although not traditional, is certainly not a new idea. Daly from her Post-Christian perspective brazenly charges the rape of Mary, and dramatically portrays a helpless image of Mary.

The rape of the rarefied remains of the Goddess in the Christian myth is mind/spirit rape. In the charming story of the "Annunciation" the angel Gabriel appears to the terrified young girl, announcing that she has been chosen to become the mother of god. Her response to this sudden proposal from the godfather is totaled nonresistance: "Let it be done unto me according to thy word." Physical rape is not necessary when the mind/will/spirit has already been invaded. In refined religious rapism, the victim is impregnated with the Supreme Seminal Idea, who becomes the Word made flesh."¹

It is a common understanding that rape victims feel helpless and powerless. However, Daly refuses to assert a feminist theodicy or theological interpretation other than her post-Christian perspective, which merely exposes Patriarchal theology, and rejects God. This project attempts to expose the rape of Mary and assert a feminist theodicy by using the modern tools of exegesis, and a feminist critical hermeneutic. This chapter will attempt to explicate from the gospel of Luke the notion that Mary sacrifices herself to God in the act of rape, and was sacrificed by God, as Jesus sacrifices himself in the act of crucifixion.

¹ Mary Daly, Gyn Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism (Boston: Beacon, 1978), 85.

Jane Schaberg like Daly charges the illegitimacy of Jesus, with the question, "Does Luke in his account allude to the law concerning the seduction or rape of a betrothed virgin (Deut. 22.23-27)? I think that he does."² Schaberg is apprehensive to say that the angel or God actually rapes or seduces Mary.³ Therein lies the difference between the work of Schaberg and this work, for herein lies the contention that Mary is the victim of rape in accordance with patriarchy as defined by the Deuteronomic laws, and Luke's report of the annunciation.

Ruether, although not suggesting the rape of Mary, proclaims that the Lucan birth narrative is our fountainhead of Mariology. Mary is portrayed as the central figure, and an active participant in the human-divine realm.⁴ This chapter proposes that the Lucan birth narrative called the annunciation of Mary is a rape myth. It contends that socially, this rape myth serves to subjugate women. Psychologically, it subjugates not only the female sides of our personality, but theologically, men and women are subjugated to the exclusively male image of God in the kingdom of God. Moreover, the importance of the human-divine relationship of Mary with God, and the divine/human relationship of God with Mary is lost while stressing only the revelation of God in his, not their, only child: a male. This projection of the kingdom of God, though nontraditional, is congruent with the notion of divine justice and equality. McFague says, "[feminist] reformers believe that the

² Jane Schaberg, The Illegitimacy of Jesus (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), 91.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Rosemary Ruether, Mary: The Feminine Face of the Church (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977), 33-34.

root-metaphor of Christianity is human liberation, not patriarchy, and that liberation for women can occur within the Christian paradigm.⁵ The subjugation of Mary is explored in order to liberate the parallels between the human-divine relationship revealed in the rape (annunciation) of Mary and the human-divine relationship revealed in the crucifixion of Christ. At the same time the possibility for a new understanding of divine/human relationship is unearthed.

The Term Sacrifice

Worship, the response of the human creature to the Divine, is summed up in sacrifice; the action which expresses more fully than any other his [sic] deep if uncomprehended relation to God.⁶

Sacrifice, according to Underhill, is the essence of worship. Underhill is quite explicit when she states that the act of sacrifice is voluntary. "For in sacrifice something is given voluntarily and unconditionally to God."⁷ It is initiated by human beings. Sacrifice is not given out of guilt nor is sacrifice something which is given up. Sacrifice is a conscious act of "self-giving of the creature to its God."⁸ In the context of Christianity, "self-giving unites the small movements of his [sic] childish soul to the external sacrifice of the Son."⁹ For a Christian then, all sacrifice is associated with the sacrifice of Christ. Underhill acknowledges that the Christian sacrifice includes the Jewish components of "atonement, redemption, communion, oblation, or the

⁵ McFague, 164.

⁶ Underhill, 47.

⁷ Ibid., 50.

⁸ Ibid., 48.

⁹ Ibid.

many needs and insights which find their fulfillment in the eucharist, and conditioned its development form."¹⁰ Her statement reveals not only her interpretation of the myth of the crucifixion of the Son, but also the Christian ritual which enables Christians to participate in the essential Christian act of sacrifice. In the Christian tradition, the myth and ritual of sacrifice are manifest in the celebration of the sacrament of the Eucharist.

From her feminist post Christian perspective Daly inherently refutes Underhill:

While the image of the sacrificial victim [Christ] may inspire saintliness in a few, in the many the effect seems to be to evoke intolerance. That is rather than being enabled to imitate the sacrifice of Jesus, they feel guilt and transfer this to 'the other' thus making the latter "imitate" Jesus in the role of scapegoat. It appears that what happens is that those under the yoke of the Christian imagery often are driven to a kind of reversal of what imagery ostensibly means. Unable to shoulder the blame for others, they can affirm themselves as "good" by blaming others.¹¹

Daly's discussion is incisive, and points us toward the limitations of traditional notions of Christian sacrifice. Daly's other is women. Women receive the guilt and blame of the males who have not been able to imitate the saintly image of Jesus.

The qualities that Christianity idealizes, especially for women, are also those of a victim: sacrificial love, passive acceptance of suffering, humility, meekness, etc. Since these are the qualities idealized in Jesus "who died for ours sins," his functioning as a model reinforces the scapegoat syndrome for women. Given the victimized situation of the female in sexist society, these "virtues" are hardly the qualities that women should be encouraged to have. Moreover, since women cannot be "good" enough to measure up to this ideal, and since all are by sexual definition alien from the male savior, this is an impossible model. Thus doomed to failure

¹⁰ Ibid., 51.

¹¹ Mary Daly, Beyond God the Father, 76.

even emulating the victim, women are plunged more deeply into victimization.¹²

Succinctly, Daly points to the problem which TePaske poses with his theory. The qualities associated with the female side of a male's personality must be sacrificed or repudiated in order for the male side of the personality to be stronger than the female side of the personality. In concrete reality this legitimates the rape of women.

However, if as Underhill suggests sacrifice is truly self-giving then it cannot functionally be limited to only the sacrifice by one sex to one side of the personality, but must be open to all people and all aspects of the human personality. The patriarchal interpretations of our myths and inclusion of only certain rituals in our faith limits our conscious awareness to the full understanding of self-giving in sacrifice. One of the limits to that full understanding is our lack of understanding of the tradition of raping women. The previous chapter describes how the rape is an act of self-giving. Both the concubine and the Levite sacrifice through rape. He uses her to atone for his sins. She submits without apparent protest because she is his property. As his wife, it is her duty to keep her priestly spouse holy. Only then, can she too be holy. Their whole society was centered on a patriarchal image of God.

This study is not a rape imperative. It is not the intention to say that women must be raped. Rather the contention is that there is a biblical basis for the ritual and myths of rape which are a part of our society and our intrapsychic self-understanding. In other words, the initial charges that Christianity generates and condones the rape may be true. There is ample

¹² Ibid., 77.

evidence that suggests and casts women in a subjugated role model of a passive rape victim. This study is a theological inquiry. What understanding of God may be unearthed in light of that overwhelming evidence of violence against women?

TePaske's psychoanalytic study of rape also projects women in the role as sacrificial victims of rape. TePaske avows that rape is a process for the individuation of the male ego. He states, "the act of rape itself is an attempt to shore up phallic pride and the weakness of an uninitiated ego entrapped in phallic self-love with little else to fall back on."¹³ He theorizes that men have ambivalence toward the female side of their personalities which Jung calls the anima.¹⁴ "Rape is a desperate attempt on the part of the sexual offender to protect and enhance the integrity of the ego."¹⁵ The intrapsychic conflict enters the material world, "when the mother is too powerfully internal and too deeply unconscious to be confronted as an inner problem, the outer woman falls victim to the concrete assertion of masculine power."¹⁶ Sacrifice is integral to the dynamics and psychological meaning of rape in "that the impulse to rape carries within it the impulse to sacrifice resulting in transformation of that same instinct."¹⁷ This anima or female side of the personality is sacrificed in rape as a part of the male's emotional maturation.

Sacrifice represents par excellence the regulatory and transformative activity of the Self. It is also particularly

¹³ TePaske, 58.

¹⁴ Ibid., 118.

¹⁵ Ibid., 72.

¹⁶ Ibid., 73.

¹⁷ Ibid., 89.

appropriate to younger men who actually do commit the crime of rape as a means of asserting their masculinity. Following rape to its extreme, for instance in the sadistic rape-murder, its deep sacrificial impulse may best be discerned.¹⁸

He refers to Jung's assertion, that "sacrifice only takes place when we feel the self actually carrying it out on ourselves, unconscious self-sacrifice is merely an accident, not a moral act." TePaske adds, "the destructive acts of the rapist, murderer represent just such an unconscious play of the archetype of sacrifice."¹⁹ So, sacrifice in rape is not necessarily a conscious act; but is nevertheless essential to male individuation, and his maturation toward a consciousness of the Self, Jung's term for God.

But regarding rape, and the sacrificial impulse inherent particularly in its sadistic forms, attention need be given specifically to the fate of the maiden, the anima, in such practices. In the struggle of the ego against its opponent- the "Dual Mother" or the serpentine shadow brother-a pivotal role is played by her. In this type of legend, a type which Catholic children have perennially found reassuring, the maiden of coming years is neatly rescued. But in rape, of course, there is no question of rescue, and in the emotional experience of a man there can be no simple escape from the fierce ambivalence toward woman which may have him in its grasp. It is the sacrifice of the anima which constitutes the real archetypal problem, for the sacrifice of the given, transient anima through life amounts to nothing less than the process of emotional maturation. In reality she is deathless, passing on to a new form,²⁰ a shimmering mirror in which the beast may notice its wings.

In the explication of his thesis, TePaske reduces the act of rape, either in dream or in the realm of the concrete to "nothing less than the process of emotional maturation for the rapist." Rape of the anima is a repetitious ritual for the anima doesn't die in the rape and murder, but returns to a new form.

¹⁸ Ibid., 126.

¹⁹ Ibid., 130.

²⁰ Ibid., 118.

Therefore, the rape continues and continues. Such thinking leads to the conclusion that although rape may indeed be a problem for male individuation; the function of women is to facilitate the process of individuation in males. Once again the woman is cast in the role of rape victim.

TePaske's association of rape with sacrifice raises to our acute consciousness the issue of violence and worship. Underhill's eloquence makes no mention of violence, nor even alludes to it when she makes reference to the sacrifice of Christ. Girard challenges Underhill's position when he theorizes that violence and the sacred are equivalent.

The failure of Modern man [sic] to grasp the nature of religion has served to perpetuate its effects. Our lack of belief serves the same function in our society that religion serves in societies more directly exposed to essential violence. We persist in disregarding the power of violence in human societies; that is why we are reluctant to admit that violence and the sacred are one and the same thing.²¹

Girard did not use the act of rape as an example of his thesis that violence and the sacred are the same. But, his generative theory of violence and the sacred would by definition not exclude rape as an act of violence or the sacred.²² TePaske makes the association of sacrifice with rape; he claims, "the impulse to rape carries within it the impulse to sacrifice."²³

²¹ Girard, 262.

²² "While acknowledging the differences, both functional and mythical, between vengeance, sacrifice, and legal punishment, it is important to recognize their fundamental identity. Precisely because these three institutions are essentially the same they tend to adopt the same types of violent response in times of crisis. Seen in the abstract, such an assertion may seem hyperbolic or simply unbelievable. It can only be appreciated by concrete examples. Only then will the utility of the comparison become apparent; customs and institutions that have remained incomprehensible, unclassifiable, and 'aberrant' heretofore make sense when seen in the light of this identity." Ibid., 25.

²³ TePaske, 89.

This discussion of Underhill's view of sacrifice, Daly's allegation that Christianity leads to the victimization of women, TePaske's theory of rape as sacrifice, and Girard's theory of violence as sacrifice, leads once again to the question of the role of women in sacrifice. Are women to serve only as the victims of rape facilitating the male individuation process? Are women to receive only the negative projections of helplessness, and powerlessness and victimization? Do women have a direct relationship with God?

Prophetically, Daly's work, unlike the history of the church she decries, permits women to participate in the contemporary sacrifice of Jesus. She claims that Christianity founded on the exclusive male image of Jesus must die, if life as we know it is to continue.²⁴ Daly continues to enact the sacrifice of Christ. Through this death of patriarchal Christianity women may find a new source of empowerment as perpetrators of the death of Jesus. Daly however, fails to realize that if as TePaske exhorts, the anima is deathless, and passes only on to a new form, then the anima, the intrapsychic image of a male Jesus, is also deathless, passing onto a new form.²⁵ This deathlessness is the essence of the eternal meaning of the resurrection. The reenactment of the crucifixion is eternal, and so is the resurrection.

The thesis of this chapter identifies violence in both of the sacred rituals. The myths surrounding the rape of Mary and the crucifixion are filled with violence. In the midst of violence sacrifice is initiated by both human and the divine in both the crucifixion and the rape (annunciation). Therefore,

²⁴ Sadly, even Daly's indictment is not without violence, as she bluntly states, "I propose that Christianity itself be castrated." Daly, Beyond God the Father, 71.

²⁵ TePaske, 118.

sacrifice refers to the moment(s) in which the human ritual and the human myth come together with the power of God. Covenants arise from union, one is the covenant of life, and the other is the covenant of deathlessness.

Structure of the Chapter

Edinger establishes a paradigm which he uses to explain the meaning of sacrifice in ego individuation.²⁶ His paradigm is used here to unearth the violence in the thesis that **the crucifixion is to Jesus what the annunciation is to Mary**. Edinger's model alleges four different paradigms of sacrifice. First, sacrifice may be initiated by the divine for the benefit of the divine. Second, sacrifice may be initiated by the divine for the benefit of humankind. Third, sacrifice may be initiated by humans for the benefit of the divine. Fourth, sacrifice may be initiated by the human for the benefit of God and humankind.²⁷ Although there are four paradigms, sacrifice is initiated by only two, the human and the divine. The purpose of the sacrifice is the same: it brings the human and the divine together.

The crucifixion of Christ is discussed using these four paradigms. Likewise, the rape of Mary is discussed using these four paradigms. Thus, there are four parallels for demonstrating the similarities and the differences in the analogy that sacrifice is common in both the crucifixion of Jesus and the rape of Mary.

²⁶ Edinger, 241-243.

²⁷ Ibid., 244.

The Crucifixion of Jesus: An Act of Sacrifice

Edinger's paradigm of sacrifice illustrates four possible explanations of the term in the usual act of worship. In each case the priest functions in a certain role, the victim is identified, and those to benefit from the sacrifice are named.²⁸ The following diagram depicts Jesus, the incarnation of God and human being, as the sacrificial victim for both God and humanity.

PRIEST	SACRIFICIAL VICTIM	FOR THE BENEFIT OF
God	sacrifices Man [Jesus]	God
God	sacrifices God [Jesus]	Man [Humanity]
Man [Humanity]	sacrifices God [Jesus]	Man [Humanity]
Man [Jesus]	sacrifices Man [Jesus]	God and Man

God Sacrifices Humanity

The first paradigm defines the role of the priest, the sacrificial victim, and the theological purpose of the sacrifice. In the context of Christianity, this paradigm is the exception to the rule. Edinger does not think that God sacrifices Jesus for the benefit of God.²⁹ He states that the sacrifice of a human being by God is usually limited to the priest who sacrifices the animal as previously discussed in the Levitical sacrifices. Little traditional evidence shows that God sins and therefore sacrifices Jesus for God. Jung, however, postulates such a theory of divine sin. Jung suggests that God's treatment of Job is God's sin, and the crucifixion of Jesus on the cross was God's atonement for God's sin against Job. Jung's thesis is certainly conducive with the violence of patriarchs. For Jung's theory is saying that God condones all

²⁸ Ibid., 242.

²⁹ Ibid., 242-245.

that happened to Job, and in so doing God condones the crucifixion of Jesus. God sacrifices Jesus for the benefit of God.³⁰

God Sacrifices God

The second paradigm refers to the Roman Catholic meaning of the eucharist. "The outstanding example is the Roman Catholic Mass in which the celebrating priest stands for God the sacrificer, and the elements represent God the sacrificed."³¹ A difference between the Roman Mass and the Protestant celebration of the Last Supper (which will be discussed in the fourth paradigm) is the doctrine of transubstantiation. In the Roman mass the bread and wine become the actual body and blood of Christ. Jesus is actually killed in the Roman Mass. The doctrine of transubstantiation is essential to the understanding of this second paradigm. A similarity between the Roman Mass and the Protestant Eucharist is the role of women. The Roman Catholic church continues to exclude women from the priesthood. It is only in the last few decades that Protestantism permits women to be the celebrant in the eucharist. This once again is evidence of a patriarchal mindset that questions the righteousness of women, and God's desire to enter into a direct and righteous relationship with women.

The Roman Mass is sacrifice containing both the myth and the ritual as follows:

Selection of the victim. As the host elements are removed from their place on the altar, Jesus is announced as the victim of this eucharistic sacrifice.

³⁰ Joseph Campbell, ed., "Answer to Job", The Portable Jung, 596-598, 601-602.

³¹ Edinger, 224.

Presentation of the victim to the priest.

The host is lifted up towards the cross on the altar and the priest makes the sign of the cross over it with the paten. The bread is thus brought into relations with Christ and his death on the cross; it is marked as a "sacrifice."³²

The elevated elements present the sacrifice to the congregation.

Intention of the ritual. The consecration of the elements in the Roman Mass brings Christ's presence. It is the moment of transubstantiation. Jesus is confronted with the intention of the sacrifice.

Act of repudiation. "The breaking of the bread that now follows is symbolic of Christ's death."³³ The priest assuming the presence of Christ breaks the bread which is the body of Christ, or as the paradigm suggests God sacrifices God.

Act of linking The Mass is "the revelation of something existing in eternity a rending of the veil of the temporal and the spatial limitation which separate the human spirit from the sight of the eternal."³⁴ The sacrifice of Jesus although a historical event is a part of the eternal. The sacrifice of Jesus is not a repeatable act, but it is a sacrifice which links human beings, and the temporal, with God, and the eternal. However, it is the custom of the ritual that the host elements are returned to their place on the altar to be used in the next Mass. As in the ancient animal sacrifices the blood remains on the altar where it is under the control of God. The Mass too, is then linked from one Mass to the next, or the present Mass is linked with previous Masses in the temporal. If Christ's sacrifice is eternal, then all masses are linked eternally.

³² Jung, "Transformation and Symbolism," 104.

³³ Ibid., 115.

³⁴ Ibid., 103.

Acts of reconciliation. There are two fundamental acts of reconciliation in the Roman Mass, the mixing of the bread and the wine, and the consumption of the elements by the congregation. The mixing of the bread and the wine is interpreted two ways. The body and the blood of Jesus are not separated, but are one.³⁵ It also symbolizes the purpose of the sacrifice as the consequence of God's transforming power: the resurrection.³⁶ After the mixing of the elements, the congregation is invited to eat the host, the body of Christ.

In so far as the offered gift is the sacrificer himself, in so far as the priest and congregation offer themselves in the sacrificial gift, and in so far as Christ is both sacrificer and sacrificed, there is a mystical unity of all parts of the sacrificial act.³⁷

The consumption of the host element, the body of Christ, is not the sacrifice but is the acceptance of God's transformation of the death of Christ, and the human reconciliation.

Closure of the ritual. The closing of the ritual is always the same, the elements are returned to their place on the altar. Throughout the mass, the priest functions as the image of Christ. It is God in Christ who sacrifices God in Christ so that all humanity might "be filled with the heavenly benediction and grace." ³⁸

Underhill would no doubt call the Mass an act of Adoration.³⁹ Daly on the other hand would probably say of the Mass, "Christian myth [and ritual]

³⁵ Ibid., 115.

³⁶ Ibid., 116.

³⁷ Ibid., 117.

³⁸ Ibid., 113.

³⁹ Underhill, 266.

like refined sugar has been 'purified' of cruder elements that were present before its processing."⁴⁰ Consequently, the Roman Mass is the coming together of both the violent ritual of the crucifixion and the violent myth of the crucifixion. Violence is central to the Mass. God's transforming power is present in the sacrifice.

Humanity Sacrifices God (Jesus) for Humanity

Edinger indicates this paradigm, "has no specific religious representation since its essence is apparently secular or personal."⁴¹ In the same paragraph, Edinger boasts that, "It is actually the greatest sacrifice of all."⁴² Christianity proposes another view of this paradigm of sacrifice, namely, Christians do participate in the crucifixion of Jesus, the incarnation of God, in the celebration of the Eucharist, and in biblical descriptions of the crucifixion event.

Girard states, "the function of sacrifice is to quell violence within the community and to prevent conflicts from erupting."⁴³ Some Christian theology and popular interpretations of the crucifixion have often laid the blame on the Jews for the crucifixion of Jesus. Caiaphas, the chief high priest was appointed by the occupying Roman leaders, and not by the Jews. According to the gospel of John 11: 49-50, Caiaphas said to them, "You do not understand that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish." The crucifixion is initiated by

⁴⁰ Dalv, Gvn/Ecology, 74.

⁴¹ Edinger, 244.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Girard, 14.

men, and violently and willing carried out by men on one single victim, the incarnation in order to quell a potentially greater violent conflict. This is one way this paradigm is used in Christianity. Feminists, such as Brownmiller, Caputi, and Daly, would no doubt suggest that such thinking is the basis for the legitimating violence against women, as a means to keep women in their place in society.⁴⁴

Humanity (Jesus) Sacrifices Humanity (Jesus)

"This fourth type of sacrifice is a hypothetical ideal . . . Christ was the first to eat his own flesh and his own blood."⁴⁵ This fourth model emphasizes the meaning that Protestant worship places on the eucharist. The remembrance of the image of Jesus in the upper room with his disciples at the Last Supper is the focus of the Protestant sacrifice. There is tremendous diversity in the way Protestants celebrate the Last Supper. It would be superfluous to discuss all the different forms of the eucharist in the Protestant churches. Most Protestants tend to celebrate the eucharist in remembrance of the last Supper in which Jesus declares his own human sacrifice, for the benefit of God and humanity.

And when the hour came, he sat at table, and the apostles with him. And he said to them, "I have earnestly desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer; for I tell you I shall not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God." And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, "Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I tell you that from now on I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." And he took bread, and when he had given thanks he broke it and gave it to them, saying, "This is my body which is given for you."⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Brownmiller, 15; Caputi, 146; and Daly, Beyond God the Father, 60-62, and 75-81.

⁴⁵ Edinger, 245.

⁴⁶ Luke 22.14-19.

And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them saying, "Drink of it, all of you, for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured for many for the forgiveness of sins."⁴⁷

The text from these gospels depicts the image of Jesus at the table with his apostles. He mentions his impending suffering, and the coming of the kingdom of God. The kingdom will come when he completes his suffering. Jesus states that the bread and wine are his body and blood. They are broken and given to the apostles. Luke is the only synoptic gospel which does not clearly indicate that Jesus eats the bread and drinks the wine with his apostles.⁴⁸ Jesus invites the disciples to participate in this communion with him, and eat of his body and drink of his blood. Likewise the Protestant sacrament invites the congregation to join with Jesus as he eats of his own body and drinks of his own blood, offering himself for sacrifice so that the kingdom of God may come. As previously stated, most Protestant doctrines reject transubstantiation, and say the bread and wine are symbols, not actually flesh and blood. Underhill calls worship an act of devotion.⁴⁹ Daly would probably say, "Just as refined sugar sweetly damages the body, purified myth seductively deceives the mind."⁵⁰ Protestantism may repress from its consciousness the crucifixion by celebrating its anticipation, nevertheless the violence of the crucifixion remains at the heart of its eucharistic sacrament.

In summary, the crucifixion of Jesus can be called a sacrifice in at least these four ways. First, God sacrifices Jesus as atonement for the sin against

⁴⁷ Matt. 26.27-28.

⁴⁸ See Matt. 26.20-29, and Mark 14.17-25.

⁴⁹ Underhill, 339-340.

⁵⁰ Daly, Gyn/Ecology, 74.

Job for the benefit of God. Second, the priest, acting as Christ, sacrifices God, the incarnation, for the benefit of all humankind. Third, the human Jesus is sacrificed by humanity for the benefit of humanity. Finally, in the Protestant celebration of the Eucharist Jesus, himself, announces his own sacrifice of himself at the Last Supper for both God and humanity.

In Eucharistic worship, the violence of the ritual is not always apparent, it is even repressed. Nevertheless, crucifixion, a violent ritual and a violent myth, is central to modern Christian worship.

The Annunciation of Mary: A Sacrifice of Rape

The introduction of the chapter expounds the theory that the **crucifixion is to Jesus what the annunciation is to Mary**. The response of Mary to the annunciation and the crucifixion are acts of ultimate sacrifice. Sacrifice is defined as the moment the human myth and the human ritual came together with the power of God. In both ritual and myth the power of God is equally present. The discussion of the analogy is as follows: first, the birth narrative is both the gospel of Luke as the source of the rape myth of Mary, and then is the source for the ritual of rape. Finally, the ritual and myth of the rape of Mary are defined according to Edinger's aforementioned paradigm of sacrifice:

1. God sacrifices Mary for God.
2. God sacrifices God in the rape of Mary for humanity.
3. Mary sacrifices God for humanity.
4. Mary sacrifices Mary for humanity and for God.

In the following argument the image of Mary as the victim of rape, the ultimate violation, is liberated. The rape of Mary is made readily visible as an essential element of the Christian faith, and it can no longer be ignored. It must be confronted.

The Myth of Rape

26 In the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God to a city of Galilee named Nazareth, 27 to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. 28 And he came to her and said, "Hail, O favored one, the Lord is with you!" 29 But she was greatly troubled at the saying, and considered in her mind what sort of greeting this might be. 30 And the angel said to her, "Do not be afraid, Mary, for you have found favor with God. 31 And behold, you will conceive in your womb and bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus. 32 He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High; and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David. 33 And he will reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there will be no end." 34 And Mary said to the angel, "How can this be, since I have no husband?" 35 And the angel said to her, "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God. 36 And behold, your kinswoman Elizabeth in her old age has also conceived a son; and this is the sixth month with her who was called barren. 37 For with God nothing will be impossible." 38 And Mary said, "Behold, I am the handmaid of the Lord; let it be to me according to your word." And the angel departed from her.⁵¹

This narrative is myth describing the rape of Mary. The Luke narrative is so common that there is no reason to elaborate further on its religious content, nor on the cosmology in the text. The focus of the paper is on the myth's function as one that condones and generates sex crimes within the patriarchal society. There are two societies which must be considered, the setting of the historical Mary, and the readers or hearers of the early Lucan text. In both of these patriarchal societies rape is condoned. The myth generates the sex crime of rape. The intrapsychic function of myth is considered in an examination of Mary's response, and also in relation to the epidemic phenomena of rape today.

The social function in the time of the historical Mary. Fiorenza's hermeneutic of suspicion is applicable in the ensuing discussion of the rape of

⁵¹ Luke 1.26-38.

Mary according to the biblical definition. Since, the scriptures are written by the male members of the patriarchy, and the laws bring order and power to men, it is important to keep in mind that rape is not a violation of a human being. Rape is a violation of the male's property: his daughter, or his wife. "Rape was not seen as a crime of sexual assault against a random woman because she is female, but rather as a calculated attempt by a man to acquire a woman as his wife against her and her parents' wishes. . . . Such an attempt is conceivable especially if we imagine a situation where one woman is sought by several suitors."⁵² Mary is considered to be the property of Joseph, because she is betrothed to him. Brooten and Biale both contend that in light of the worldview held by the governing patriarchy in this ancient context, the violation in the seduction and rape of Mary is against Joseph and not Mary.⁵³ The rape of Mary according to Luke must be examined according to the biblical definition of rape as found in Deut. 22. 25-27.

But if in the open country a man meets a young woman who is betrothed, and the man seizes her and lies with her, then only the man who lays with her shall die. But to the young woman you shall do nothing; in the young woman there is no offense punishable by death, for this case is like that of a man attacking and murdering his neighbor; because he came upon her in the open country, and though the betrothed young woman cried for help there was no one to rescue her.

A man is guilty of rape if: (1) he rapes a betrothed woman, and (2) she is out in the country, where no one can hear her cry out for help. Luke is explicit in stating that Mary is a betrothed virgin: "to a virgin betrothed to a

⁵² Biale, 241.

⁵³ Ibid., 240, and Brooten, 4-5.

man whose name was Joseph . . . and the virgin's name was Mary."⁵⁴ Luke is intentional in the sequence of the naming of the characters. Joseph is named first and then, Mary; this emphasizes the virgin's betrothal to a man. This man is a particular man, who is named Joseph, from the house of David. The betrothed virgin, unlike the concubine in Judges, is named, but neither the concubine's nor Mary's lineage is mentioned. The evidence that Mary is the property of another man is established in the opening sentence.

The second condition of a rape requires that the rape occur "out in the country where no one can hear her cry for help." The description in Luke reports only that Gabriel is sent from God to Nazareth. It doesn't specifically describe the location of their meeting. More importantly it does not report where the betrothed virgin is overshadowed by the power of the Most High. Is it then, in the presence of Gabriel? Do Mary's words, "as you have spoken so be it" indicate her submission?⁵⁵ The text doesn't explicitly describe the setting, but that is not sufficient reason to eliminate rape. Assume the opposite, the "overshadowing" occurs in the city of Nazareth, then according to Deuteronomic law, Mary is guilty of adultery and subject to death.

"If there is a betrothed virgin, and a man meets her in the city and lies with her, then you shall bring both out to the gate of that city, and you shall stone them to death with stones, the young woman because she did not cry for help though she was in the city, and the man because he violated his neighbor's wife; so you shall purge evil from the midst of you."⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Luke 1.27.

⁵⁵ J. Reiling and J.L.Swellengrebel, A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 64.

⁵⁶ Deut. 22.23-24.

However, there is no discussion of adultery in the Gospel of Luke as there is in Matthew.⁵⁷ Also, Mary is not subjected to the rigorous ritual meant to expose an adulteress. An accused woman is brought before the priests at the tabernacle and is subjected to a ritualistic interrogation. It culminates in an act in which she must drink water bittered by the dirt from the floor of the synagogue, and the guilty adulteress will discover that her "belly shall distend and her thigh shall sag; and the woman shall become a curse among her people."⁵⁸ Reportedly, Mary did not have to experience the humiliation of such an encounter, so Luke is not directing the reader to understand Mary as an adulteress.

Reportedly, Mary may not have cried for help, and from a twentieth century perspective a reader might argue that since she didn't protest she consented. However, in Mary's historical context, consent was not the issue in the laws.⁵⁹ Mary does protest: she expresses that she does not have a husband. Her statement is yet another indication that she has no desire to commit adultery. Biblically, consent of the female was not an issue, the issue was whether she cried for help. The biblical law indicates that in a city she would be heard if she cries for help, and in the country she would not be heard. Our modern thinking often leads us to the false conception that if a woman is in the country alone, then either she is asking for and deserves to be raped, or because she does not cry for help she wants to have sexual

⁵⁷ Schaberg, 91-92.

⁵⁸ Num. 5.12-31.

⁵⁹ Rowland, 93-94. The criterion of consent on the part of the victim is not an issue in the biblical definition of rape as it is in contemporary rape laws. Today if a man accused of rape thinks he had consent then it is a complete defense of rape.

relations with the attacker.⁶⁰ However, according to Jewish law, ancient women spend considerable time in isolation from their families during the time of their flow of blood. This flow of blood is listed among the states of impurity and purity in Leviticus. "When a woman has a discharge of blood which is her regular discharge from her body, she shall be in her impurity for seven days, and whoever touches her shall be unclean until the evening."⁶¹ A menstruating woman requires segregation from the members of her family and strangers.⁶² Mary, like other Jewish women, would be isolated in the country during this time, and vulnerable to the attack of a rapist. The notion that a woman alone is just asking for it is a false conception; then as it is now.

The two Deuteronomic laws naturally presume that the two individuals are caught. In the situation with Mary, they are not caught. The angel simply departs. The law does not account for charges brought by a female against a rapist. The event comes to a close, and even though the two are not caught, Mary would have no legal options anyway. The property of Joseph is violated, and there is not any legal recourse available to Mary. The seizure of Mary for the birth of God's only child may be the rape of Mary, but it is a crime against Joseph according to the law. This brief examination of these two laws has impact, as it illuminates the possibility that the annunciation is a veil for the rape of Mary.

There is another historical consideration, and that is the precedent of

⁶⁰ Burgess, and Holmstrom, 11.

⁶¹ Lev. 15.19.

⁶² Biale, 148.

rape as the means to give life to the heirs of the kingdom of Yahweh. This precedent is discussed in some detail in the third chapter. Briefly this text establishes rape as the legal means to bring life to Yahweh's heirs.

16 Then the elders of the congregation said, "What shall we do for wives for those who are left, since the women are destroyed out of Benjamin?" 17 And they said, "There must be an inheritance for the survivors of Benjamin, that a tribe be not blotted out from Israel. 18 Yet we cannot give them wives of our daughters." For the people of Israel had sworn, "Cursed be he who gives a wife to Benjamin." 19 So they said, "Behold, there is the yearly feast of the Lord at Shiloh, which is north of Bethel, on the east of the highway that goes up from Bethel to Shechem, and south of Lebo'nah." 20 And they commanded the Benjaminites, saying, "Go and lie in wait in the vineyards, 21 and watch; if the daughters of Shiloh come out to dance in the dances, then come out of the vineyards and seize each man his wife from the daughters of Shiloh, and go to the land of Benjamin. 22 And when their fathers or their brothers come to complain to us, we will say to them, 'Grant them graciously to us; because we did not take for each man of them his wife in battle, neither did you give them to them, else you would now be guilty.'" 23 And the Benjaminites did so, and took their wives, according to their number, from the dancers whom they carried off; then they went and returned to their inheritance, and rebuilt the towns, and dwelt in them. 24 And the people of Israel departed from there at that time, every man to his tribe and family, and they went out from there every man to his inheritance.⁶³

The need for heirs arises when the Benjaminite women are killed, and the men have no wives. The elders of the tribes are firm; no daughters are to be given in marriage to the Benjarrinites. Paradoxically, the elders also recognize that no tribe in the house of Israel can be "blotted out". Ergo, the Benjaminites are directed to go and seize the daughters of Shiloh who are out in the open country, and rape them. It does not matter if they are betrothed, unbetrothed or married; they are to be seized. In this way the Benjaminites may have heirs to their inheritance, the land given them by Yahweh.

⁶³ Judg. 21.16-24.

Likewise, Gabriel states to the betrothed virgin that once again the intention of his presentation to her is that an heir to the kingdom of God is needed.

He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High; and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David, and he will reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there will be no end. ⁶⁴

The twelve tribes of Israel establish the historical precedent, rape is an appropriate means to obtain an heir to the kingdom of God. The seizure of another man's property, a woman, or rape, is not a new method for bringing another heir into being, there is a precedent. The difference for Mary is that her heir will be called, Holy, the Son of God.

The purpose of the evidence presented is not intended as conclusive proof of a historical rape of Mary. Given the historical context of Mary's life, however, Mary's world view of herself can begin to be constructed. First, she sees herself as the property of Joseph. Gabriel attempts to violate Joseph's property, when the angel presents himself to Mary. She recognizes it as a violation. Frightened though she was, it was neither impossible nor inconceivable, for her to perceive that the property of another might be taken to bring an heir into the kingdom of God. It is probable that Mary did not perceive herself as a free individual. Mary did not perceive herself as an individual with whom God would seek covenant. As modern readers we must keep in mind the possibility that God might have viewed Gabriel's presentation as neither rape nor a violation of Joseph's property, in spite of the overwhelming evidence against such a possibility.

⁶⁴ Luke 1:32-33.

Mary's response as intra-psychic function. The writers of the Deuteronomic law do not consider that the woman might be so immobilized by her fear that she might not be able to scream, or yell for help, because she is in some way prevented from so doing.⁶⁵

Although the legal conditions for rape in antiquity do not account for the behavioral responses of the victims, there is no reason to assure that women, at any historical moment, respond differently to the violation of their bodies than do human beings at any other moment in history. Martin Symonds summarizes responses to violent crimes:

In my studies of victims of violent crimes the following responses have been noted. The first and immediate response of all individuals, to unexpected violence is shock and disbelief. When realization sets in, the vast majority of victims then experience fright which borders on panic. This fright-panic response is especially true where there is prolonged contact with the criminal, such as in the crime of rape. . . . When a victim experiences fright bordering on panic there is a heightened distortion of perceptive thinking and judgement. All behavior is directed at self-preservation. Most learned behavior seems to evaporate, and the victim responds with adaptive and innate patterns of early childhood.⁶⁶ I have called this response traumatic psychological infantilism.

Martin Symonds identifies the four behavioral responses to violence: (1) shock and disbelief; (2) fright; (3) heightened distortion of perceptive thinking and judgement; and (4) all behavior is directed at self-preservation.

The description of Mary's response to the angel Gabriel is similar to the responses reported by Symonds' studies. "But she was greatly troubled at the saying, and considered in her mind what sort of greeting this might be."⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Martin Symonds, "The Rape Victim: Psychological Patterns of Response," American Journal of Psychoanalysis 36 (1976), 30.

⁶⁶ Symonds, 29.

⁶⁷ Luke 1.29.

Mary's first response is that of being troubled by his greeting. Immediately her thinking is distorted; she does not understand what the angel means by the greeting. The angel does not clarify his meaning, but instead comments on Mary's response which he himself labels as fear, "Do not be afraid."⁶⁸ In this brief exchange of words, Mary exhibits three of Symonds behavioral responses to rape: shock and disbelief at the presence of the angel, fear and distorted thinking. Self-preservation is observable later in the sequence of the rape.

Resistance, both passive and active, is common to attacks of violence.

Passive patterns of resistance, verbal or physical, attempt to stop the rapist's behavior by trying to induce guilt or appeal to the rapist's conscience. . . . Some of the verbal manifestations of passive resistance are; "Don't you have your own woman?"; "I am pregnant"; "I'm going to vomit"; "Why do you want to do this to me?"; "I have children"; "My mother just died"; "I just lost my baby"; "You are a nice person. You wouldn't want to do anything you would be ashamed of."⁶⁹

After the angel states his intention that she will conceive and bear a child, Mary attempts to resist him in what Symonds would describes as a passive verbal manifestation. She asks the question "How can this be, since I have no husband?"⁷⁰

The angel makes it quite evident that Mary is powerless in the situation:

"The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born. . . . For with God nothing is impossible"⁷¹

⁶⁸ Luke 1.29b.

⁶⁹ Symonds, 32.

⁷⁰ Luke 1.34b.

⁷¹ Luke 1.35b-d, and 37.

Symonds has this to say about the typical response of women during rape:

The behavior of the vast majority of women during their contact with rapists demonstrates this traumatic psychological infantilism. In the atmosphere of primal terror, not only do people submit but also psychological infantilism, with its consequent helplessness, makes it appear to the outsider that their behavior was friendly and cooperative. It is a response of frozen fright that confuses everyone: the rapist, the victim's family, her friends, the police, and even the victim herself.

For example, a young woman who was raped described her reactions as follows: "I was just that scared. I would have done anything he asked. I felt he was capable of anything including killing me. He reminded me of my father, his looks and the violence. It seemed to reinforce my fear of him."

A rapist blamed a girl of eighteen for his having torn her clothing. He said she had not cooperated with him. She started to cry and said, "I'm sorry I was bad."

The frozen fright response of a psychological infantilism looks like cooperative behavior. The victim may smile even initiate acts, and may appear relaxed and calm. But frozen fright has its roots in profound⁷² primal terror. The individual submits in order not to be killed.

Mary does respond to the angel, she speaks, "Behold, I am the handmaid of the Lord; let it be to me according to your word."⁷³ Mary's words are submissive, and according to Symonds reflect her self-preservation, which is promised to her if she permits the power of the Holy Spirit to overshadow her.

Mary's response attempts and has attempted for centuries to tell us of her terror in the presence of the angel Gabriel. Her behavior models the apparent passive, defenseless response as normative to the intrusion of a rapist. Consequently, the consciousness of women and men fail to recognize the terror she conveys, and the terror remains hidden in the psyche.

⁷² Symonds, 30.

⁷³ Luke 1.38.

The social-historical relevance of rape myths in antiquity. The evangelist Luke may have specific intentions to include the rape of Mary in his introduction to hebraic Christianity, whether or not this event literally happened. His suspected audiences are the ancient Romans, or Greco-Roman Gentiles.⁷⁴ Their mythology is filled with rape myths. Their gods rape goddesses and human females. The myth of Persephone and Demeter is not only a rape myth, but it is also the story of death and resurrection. It is ritualized in the mystery religions.⁷⁵ Luke's rape narrative introduces the Christian story of death and resurrection, just as the rape myth of Prosepina or Demeter introduces the Greco-Roman myth of death and resurrection.⁷⁶ This myth arises from Agrarian cultures in which women play the dominant role in the transition from a nomadic to a settled way of life.⁷⁷ The women till the soil, plant the seeds and nurture the land. The myths from the female centered societies reflect the annual cycle of planting, the dormant death as the seeds grow underground, and then flourish in the Spring. The Greek myth tells of Persephone's capture and conquest by Hades who takes her to the underground. While she is away Demeter mourns and grieves; nothing is permitted to grow. The land is a barren waste. Upon Persephone's release from Hades ordered by Zeus, Demeter permits vegetation to flourish.

⁷⁴ Joseph Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke I-IX (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979), 57-59, and Vincent Taylor, "Gospel of Luke," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 3, (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981), 181, 186. Fitzmyer suggests that the audience are Greco-Roman Gentiles, and Taylor suggests the place of writing is Rome for Roman readers.

⁷⁵ Sarah Pomeroy, Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves (New York: Schocken, 1975), 215.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 216.

⁷⁷ James George Frazer and Theodore H. Gaster, The New Golden Bough (Great Meadows, NJ: S.G. Phillips, 1965), 366-369.

Spretnak laments that in its original form the Demeter/Persephone myth is not a rape myth. Persephone is not captured, nor is she raped; she simply goes underground to tend the seedlings growth in the darkness of the underworld. However, the myth changes form around the seventh century B.C. Rape is included in the myth to illustrate male authority and power over females.⁷⁸ The recent work of archeologists tends to support her thesis. There is some evidence that rape emerges as a result of the inequalities of the complexities of social evolution from primitive societies into militaristic, and/or urban economic societies.⁷⁹ Consequently, the original myth symbolizes the meaning of life and death, and the Olympian version retains the meaning of life and death, but adds a new dimension: **rape**.

The myth of Persephone and Demeter was enacted in worship as well. There is little extant detail of the exact form and content of the worship. Generally, the Roman rites consisted of purification and abstinence. Female participants reenacted the myth.⁸⁰ The religious activities of the cults were limited to female participants; however, Roman males were briefly permitted to participate in the early second century B.C.E. However, debauchery occurred during the worship, leading to mass executions, and a senatorial decreed mandating the exclusions of all males from the festivals.⁸¹

⁷⁸ Charlene Spretnak, Lost Goddesses of Early Greece (Boston: Beacon, 1978), 105.

⁷⁹ Julia Schwendinger and Herman Schwendinger, Rape and Inequality (Beverly Hills: Sage Publs., 1983), 209-210.

⁸⁰ Pomeroy, 216.

⁸¹ Ibid., 217.

Given the prelevance of rape myths, it would have been unlikely that the Roman, and Greco-Roman patriarchs -- knowledgeable of the Demeter/Persephone rape myth as well as exclusion from the cult's rites -- would have been surprised by the rape of the betrothed virgin, named Mary, by a deity. The introductory narrative might well be intended to syncretistically bring the religious from the pagan traditions of the Greeks and Romans into the Judeo-Christian tradition. Thus, the rape of Mary tended to support the existing social order of that time period. In the minds of the early readers, the rape of human beings by a patriarchal God is to be expected. The myths of the patriarchal religion continues today to condone sex crime in the kingdom of God that Christ brings.

The Ritual of Rape

This part of the chapter will elicit the ritual of rape from Luke 1.26-37. In the first chapter, seven gestures are used to compare the actions of a rapist toward his victim, with the actions of a priest toward the sacrificial animal. Although the Lucan narrative does not include the naming of any specific gestures in the annunciation of Mary; the seven gestures are implicit in the narrative.

Selection of the victim.

In the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God to a city of Galilee named Nazareth, to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David and the virgin's name was Mary.⁸²

Obviously Mary is the intended victim; she is named, and God specifically directs Gabriel to go to the city in which she lives. The apparent reason for choosing Mary is that she is betrothed to a man from the house of David.

⁸² Luke 1.26-27.

Ample biblical narratives show that God and the people of Israel find favor with David.⁸³ So, Mary is selected because she, a virgin, is the property of the house of David.

Presentation of the victim to the priest or rapist.

He came to her and said, "Hail O favored one, the Lord is with you."⁸⁴

In a manner similar to the rapists, Eric and Oliver, Gabriel goes to the victim, instead of taking the victim to the altar. The fact is obvious; Gabriel does not make a threatening remark to his victim, but that doesn't lessen the impact of his presence. Neither Eric nor Oliver present themselves in a violent way initially.⁸⁵

Act of intention. In the third chapter the act of intention is shown in the actions of the priest, and the actions of the rapist. The priest or offerer touches the victim on the head, whereas the sadistic rapist points a gun at her face, but no contact is made.⁸⁶ Neither physical contact nor the use of a weapon is mentioned in Gabriel's encounter of Mary. Gabriel confronts Mary with his words, "and behold you will conceive in your womb and bear a son."⁸⁷ It is obvious to Mary the intention of Gabriel is the sexual violation of Joseph's exclusive rights to her as his betrothed. Conquest is manifest in the language of the rapist and not in the use of a weapon.⁸⁸ Gabriel's

⁸³ 1 Sam. 16.26 and 10, and 2 Samuel.

⁸⁴ Luke 1.28.

⁸⁵ Groth, and Birnbaum, 429-430.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 25.

⁸⁷ Luke 1.31a.

⁸⁸ Groth and Birnbaum, 43.

approach is different from the sadistic rapist; it is similar to the power rapist. Force may not be used if his victim is subdued through a verbal threat. The angel does not need to use force or weaponry, for his powerful use of words adequately conveys the intention of their meeting to violate Joseph's property. Mary may be raped, but Joseph is the offended party.

Act of renunciation.

The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God.⁸⁹

Gabriel may not graphically describe the penetration of Mary's vagina by a penis, nonetheless the goal of both the angel and God is conception of the child. The language the angel employs may be construed as poetic, and there is little doubt that the birth of the child is the will of God, and Mary is to be the mother. This, then, is the act of repudiation; the divine repudiates the ownership of Mary by Joseph, in the union of Mary with the divine. It is not Mary who is repudiated in this act, but Joseph's ownership of her.

Act of linking. Then, the angel Gabriel said to Mary:

And behold, your kinswoman Elizabeth in her old age has also conceived a son; and this is the sixth month with her who was called barren.⁹⁰

In Levitical rituals this act refers to the mingling of blood from previous ritual. The blood is sprinkled about the altar where blood from previous sacrifices has been sprinkled. The sprinkled blood comes under the control of Yahweh. Unlike the Levite who must have drained the blood from the body of his unnamed concubine, and then dismembered her, God chooses not to have

⁸⁹ Luke 1.35b-c.

⁹⁰ Luke 1.36.

the body of Mary brought to the altar to kill her and drain her blood. Instead, God, the source of all blood, comes together with the blood of Mary into a covenant of new life for all human kind. This sacrifice is different in that the menstrual blood from two different women is not mingled in an altar, instead God brings life to their wombs and that new life will find nourishment from that blood which lines the walls of their wombs. This introduces a radical idea into the society, a woman's menstrual blood is not a source of impurity, but of new life. It is at this time when God and Mary are united, it is the moment of sacrifice.

Act of reconciliation.

39 In those days Mary arose and went with haste into the hill country of Judah, 40 and she entered the house of Zechariah and greeted Elizabeth. 41 And when Elizabeth heard the greeting of Mary; the babe leaped in her womb; and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit and 42 she exclaimed with a loud cry, "Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit of your womb!"⁹¹

The notable act of reconciliation is Mary's pregnancy which is the purpose of the rape. The fact that Mary departs and remains with Elizabeth for three months is another response typical to victims of rape. Burgess and Holmstrom describe one of the aspects of the long-term process of rape recovery as reorganization or changes in life style.

The rape very often upsets the victim's normal routine of living. . . . Many victims are able to resume only a minimal level of functioning even after the acute phase ends [a period which lasts from the first few hours to the first few days or weeks]. . . . A common response was to turn for support to family members not normally seen on a daily basis. Often this meant a trip home to some other city.⁹²

⁹¹ Luke 1.39-42.

⁹² Burgess and Holmstrom, 41-42.

The text alleges that Mary arises and immediately departs. Her reaction is consistent with a victim of rape. She departs to be in a place where she might have daily contact with her kinswoman Elizabeth. Mary seeks the affirmation and assurance of her female family member.

Mary goes alone for no mention is made of Joseph's presence. That is not extraordinary for a victim of rape. Both a fear of men, and a fear of sexual relationship with the victim's spouse or partner is not uncommon.⁹³ Apparently, Mary at this time, doesn't seek the reconciliation with Joseph. Mary accepts God's renunciation of Joseph's ownership.

Closure of the ritual. The closure of this ritual is just as abrupt as the closure of rape by the convicted rapists in the second chapter. Eric and Oliver simply depart from their victims. It is so in this case, for the text reads, "the angel departed."⁹⁴

The Rape of Mary as Sacrifice

The thesis of this chapter asserts that both the crucifixion and the rape of Mary are acts of sacrifice. Sacrifice is the moment in which the human ritual and the human myth, come together with the power of God. Sacrifice is phenomenological. The agony Mary suffers in rape is sacrifice.

The fourfold paradigm of sacrifice can be diagrammed in the following manner:

God	sacrifices	Mary	for God
God	sacrifices	God	for humanity

⁹³ Ibid., 46.

⁹⁴ Luke 1.38c

Marv sacrifices God for humanitv

Mary sacrifices Mary for humanity and God

God sacrifices Mary for God. In the previous section, this paradigm is discussed as Jung's theory of God's expiation of sin in the crucifixion of Christ. Unlike Jung's theory, Mary suffers the torment of rape in order to bring an end to the reign of humankind, and the beginning of the reign of God's only Son. In other words this sacrifice is not a precursor to the crucifixion, and the resurrection, but is God's participation in the incarnation, and the creation of life. Prior to the birth of Christ, the crucifixion is unknown and unanticipated. The fulfillment of God's promise is the birth of the incarnation. At the time of Mary, the patriarchal world-view precluded the possibility that God would seek a woman for the fulfillment of God's promise. Furthermore, no woman is free to enter into a direct covenant with God. It is not possible for Mary to realize that she has freedom. She is betrothed. She is the property of Joseph, whether she likes it or not. God's goodness and omnipotence attempts to intervene and repudiate such world-views by seeking Mary for covenantal incarnation. Needless to say, the world view of Mary's day simply would not permit Mary to believe that God seeks a woman for a covenant, nor does it permit Mary to be free to enter such a covenant. The prevailing patriarchy can condone an image of God's sex crime against Joseph's property, while Mary experiences the pain. The patriarchal interpretation must be rape in order to maintain the status quo of women, and the patriarchal image of God.

God sacrifices God for humankind. It is God's intention to intervene in the world. The divine human relationship is exclusively a transcendent relationship until the incarnation. The transcendent divine human relationship is sacrificed when Mary's womb carries the flesh of God. One image of God is

sacrificed for the incarnational image. When God approaches Mary through the angel Gabriel, God renounces the patriarchal image of divine. God is not a male seeking an exclusive all male rulership. God is good and omnipotent seeking an incarnational covenant with a female.

Mary sacrifices God for humankind. Mary, the victim of rape also sacrifices the same transcendent image of God for an image of one that could overshadow her, and causes to be born a holy child who would reign over the house of Jacob, and inherit the throne of David. Mary sacrifices the traditional image of God for the coming realm. However, Mary, like a slave in captivity is limited by her own consciousness. If she had a consciousness of herself as free being, then perhaps she would have realized that God seeks her in covenant. As a free woman, she can accept or reject a covenant with God. As an oppressed woman, she can not even recognize the liberation that God offers her.

Mary sacrifices Mary for humanity and God. With the submissive words, "Let it be to me according to your words," Mary sacrifices herself to the fear, the terror, and the ultimate violation of rape. She too, must know the law. She may be giving up her life, just as the unnamed concubine eventually must do. Mary's life is no longer as it has been. She flees to her kinswoman, returns home and gives birth to this infant son. She is to be visited by angels, and shepherds, She is to hear the prophetic promise of Simeon at the circumcision of her son. Her life no longer belongs to Joseph. It forever belongs to God as the mother of Jesus, "For henceforth all generations will call me blessed." ⁹⁵ As with contemporary rape survivors,

⁹⁵ Luke 1.48b.

with the rape of the betrothed virgin, Mary's life as she knows it comes to an end. A new life begin for herself, all humankind, and for God.

Conclusion

Two individual human beings suffer tremendously. Mary is raped. The birth of Jesus follows her rape. Jesus is crucified. God's resurrection of Jesus follows the crucifixion. Rape is for Mary what the crucifixion is for Jesus.

The veiled rape of Mary, known as the annunciation, is central to Advent Worship. Christians are invited to share in the celebration of the annunciation. The crucifixion is central to the celebration of the eucharist. Worshippers are invited to participate the sacrifice of Jesus. Violence is central to worship.

Does the rape of Mary mean that God condones rape, so that Jesus may be born, and women are meant to be raped, and that all men must be rapists? Does God condone crucifixion so that greater good may occur?

These are questions which must be asked of patriarchal religion. In a patriarchal world that prevents God from direct covenants with women, and rejects God's incarnation by crucifixion, it is no wonder that violence is central to worship. Within the patriarchal kingdom of God these question are purely rhetorical.

A feminist theodicy requires that these questions receive a negative response. Feminists must eke out yet another understanding of an all good and omnipotent God in the face of atrocities, and the overwhelming feelings of powerlessness, and defeat.

The patriarchal society inculcates in the hearts and minds of all human beings that women are not free beings, and God would never make a covenant with woman. God only makes covenant with men. God would rape a woman, but never make a covenant. It is God who acts to subvert the patriarchal structure by seeking a direct covenant with a woman. God's power will not be thwarted by even patriarchal societies. God reaches out to women, through a woman named Mary, to make a new covenant. God seeks to make a covenant that will bring an end to the patriarchal superstition that women are to be equated as the property of their fathers and spouses, and bring the promised Messiah, the incarnation. The covenant between God and Mary should make the world a better place to live.

Human beings entrapped by the violence perpetuated by a patriarchal society reject God, the incarnation. It is not God who condones nor permits the crucifixion of Christ. It is God who accepts the human response to divine intervention. God defeats the violence perpetuated in the act of crucifixion, by overcoming death. Christ is resurrected from the dead. The centrality of this violence keeps us mindful that even God cannot be violently overthrown.

It is a comforting and prophetic reminder that God cannot be subdued by oppressive societies, nor violently overthrown through crucifixion. Daly says the continuation of patriarchal Christianity may end life as we know it, but that does not mean that God will be destroyed.

Chapter 5

Toward a Feminist Theodicy

This project is a feminist theodicy. It attempts to respond to the allegations that the patriarchal religion condones, if not generates, the sex crime of rape, and consequently, the patriarchal religion and its God ought to be abandoned. This theodicy responds by confessing that, yes, women as victims of rape are to the rapist what the sacrificial animal is to the priest. The victim of rape is physically manipulated with the same gestures as the animal in burnt offerings. This analogy reduces the human victim of rape to the status of the animal. The animal is the property of the offerer. Likewise, rabbinic law implies that female humans are the property of their fathers until betrothal, and then become the property of their spouses. In the examination of Judges, females are treated like animals. The animal's life is substituted in the place of the offerer's life, and a concubine's life is substituted in the place of the Levite's life. Likewise, women, as if they are part of a herd, instead of human beings, are seized and raped to insure that there will be Israelite heirs to the kingdom of God. Consent of the women is never sought. In these rituals of rape, as in the ancient rituals of worship, women, like animals, are subjected to the same violent terrors.

The act of worship is to the offerer or worshipper, what the act of rape is to the rapist. The animal offered receives the transfer of the offerer's sin,

and through the animal's death, the offerer's sin is atoned. Likewise, the concubine in Judges serves the same purpose as the animal. Her husband, the Levite, unintentionally, is faced with the threat of unwanted sodomy. It may be unwanted, but for the Levite it would be an unwitting violation of the law of Yahweh. So, the concubine is offered to the strangers in the place of the Levite. She is raped and her body dismembered. Her death and dismemberment proves that her life is the one that atones for the unintentional sin of the Levite. The concubine, like the animal, receives the sin, and in death, there is atonement for his sin.

TePaske's theory tends to support the behavior on behalf of the Levite as a healthy choice. In a patriarchal society the female side of the male's personality must be sacrificed for the male side to be dominant. TePaske contends that rape fantasy, and concrete rape are the means for the individuation or personality maturation of the human male in such a society. The Levite not only stayed alive, but maintained a positive self-image too.

Crucifixion is for Jesus what the annunciation is for Mary. The third analogy describes the relationship between two human beings who sacrifice themselves for God. Both of these acts of sacrifice are a response to God. In both, it is God who seeks the direct human relationship and sacrifice of both of them for God and for humanity. The violence in both acts is perceivable.

Gabriel says to Mary, "You have found favor with God . . . the power of the Most high will overshadow you."¹ At the transfiguration, God speaks to Peter, James and John as "a cloud came and overshadowed them; and they

¹ Luke 1.30, and 35b.

were afraid as they entered the cloud. And a voice came out of the cloud, saying, 'This is my Son, my Chosen; listen to him!'"² In these texts it is God who selects and then initiates contact with these two human beings: Mary and Jesus. God seeks human covenant in the crucifixion of Christ, just as God seeks human covenant in the rape of Mary.

These are also sacrifices initiated by the human beings. Human beings decide that the death of one person is preferable to the death of many. Jesus consents saying, "Nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done."³ Jesus sacrifices himself in the act of crucifixion. Human beings deny women the opportunity to be in direct covenant with God. In what must have been construed as rape, Mary sacrifices herself. Mary consents saying, "Let it be to me according to your word."⁴ Mary sacrifices herself in the act of rape.

The study of these three analogies of the human to human relationship, the human to divine, and the divine to human, shows that at the heart of both rape and worship is violence. Violence is discerned in the ritual, myth, and sacrifice. The grotesque and violent gestures of the ritual of rape are the same grotesque and violent rituals of animal sacrifice. The center of the unearthed myth and the myth of worship is the same: it is violence. Violence in the sacrifice of an animal is the punishment of death for the sinner. The crucifixion is undeniable agonizing, and the annunciation is a veiled word for rape. Finally, the three analogies show that violence is common and essential to both rape and worship. These three analogies advance a striking metaphor that rape is worship.

² Luke 10.34-35.

³ Luke 22.42b.

⁴ Luke 1.38b.

This metaphor contends that violence is perpetuated by patriarchal religions. The metaphor acknowledges the similarity between the ritual of rape, and the ritual of animal sacrifice, and the eucharist. These similarities cannot be dismissed as purely coincidental. The rituals are manifestations of the myth. The myth tells us that the person is raped, and the animal is killed to bring others into relationship with God. Violence cannot be dismissed as an archaic form of worship. This study shows that violence is at the center of the eucharist, and further that the annunciation is yet another veiled form of violence. This project shows that the world-view Mary held of herself at the time of the annunciation, and the probable world-view held of Mary by the early readers, perceived that she must have been a rape victim. So, Mary's self perception is, as she is perceived: powerless and unable to enter into covenant with God. The metaphor does not say, however, that rape is synonymous with worship. In other words, the metaphor does not imply that worship is evil. Nor does the metaphor deny that rape is evil.

Amir's research leads to the theory that the victim of rape is the cause and is responsible for this violent act.⁵ In addition, recent studies show that guilt is a common response among rape victims.⁶ While it is not the intent of their studies to corroborate the work of Amir, they do describe how victims

⁵ "In a way, the victim is always the cause of the crime. . . . The concept of victim precipitation (VP) rests on another model: victim doer victim. Here, the victim is the one who is acting out, initiating the interaction between her and the offender, and by her behavior she generates the potentiality for criminal behavior of the offender or triggers this potentiality, if it existed before in him. Her behavior transforms him into a doer by directing his criminal intentions which not only lead to the offense but also may shape its form." Amir, 259.

⁶ Holstrom and Burgess, 39.

experience the prolonged feelings of guilt after the violation of their bodies. The indication is that victims themselves do tend to feel responsible for this evil atrocity. However, there is a difference between feeling responsible and being responsible. Consent is never sought from the animals sacrificed; the Levite doesn't seek consent from the concubine. He speaks with her father and apparently receives his consent. The Levite doesn't ask the concubine if she wishes to be sacrificed to the men of the city. Likewise, the Benjaminites do not seek consent of the daughters of Shiloh. Rape is the methodology recommended by the fathers and the brothers to the males of the twelve tribes of Israel. So, the Benjaminites without hesitations simply seize and rape the daughters. The study of Judges inherently questions the worth of human females in the eyes of the patriarchal society's image of God. Women are not the heirs to the kingdom of God; Judges 21 reiterates that. It is the sons of the fathers of the twelve tribes of Israel who are the heirs to Yahweh's kingdom, and not the daughters of Shiloh. In fact, nothing is to deny these males heirs their divine inheritance, not even the rights of women. It is too late when Gabriel approaches Mary and asks her consent. Her psyche has received the inculcation of patriarchal oppression. She cannot perceive herself as a free person, so acquiescence is the passive response of a terrified victim of rape. Apparently, the patriarchal society projects a patriarchal God and kingdom onto its religious reality. There can be little doubt that the pejorative treatment of these women is evil, and symptomatic of misogyny.

The rape metaphor acknowledges the centrality of violence in both rape and worship. It does not suggest that the power of the divine is limited in any way; nor does it suggest that the whole idea of God ought to be exorcised as suggested by Daly. According to McFague, a metaphor is "an assertion or

judgment of similarity and difference between two thoughts in permanent tension with one another which redescribes reality in an open ended way but has structural as well as affective power."⁷ McFague recognizes that the function of a metaphor is the redescription of a reality in a statement which synthesizes two thoughts in permanent **tension**. This redescription contains two catalysts, **affective** and **structural power**. In the metaphor, rape is worship, these two criteria can be explicated.

Tension

There is little doubt of tension within this metaphor. Obvious is the tension between the common understanding of rape and worship. Tension is contended in the Introduction: rape is an act of evil, and worship is an act of glorifying God. In fact, the metaphor that rape is worship is both shocking and unconventional, which, according to McFague, is not an uncommon reaction to a new metaphor.⁸ The test of the metaphor lies not in its ability to shock us, but in its ability to expand and transform our reality. "Old views of reality are exchanged for new ones. Metaphor is basically a new or unconventional interpretation of reality whether that interpretation refers to a limited aspect of reality or to a totality of it."⁹ In the context of this project, this metaphor, rape is worship, demands that the notion that the present kingdom of God is liberating needs to be abandoned. Within the boundaries of the kingdom of God women are oppressed. Women are raped. At one time the biblical patriarchy employed rape as a methodology for

⁷ McFague, 43.

⁸ Ibid., 17.

⁹ Ibid., 40.

retaining divine inheritance, or atoning for sins. At one time the gospel readers perceived God to be a rapist, violating the property of a man named Joseph, his betrothed virgin Mary. This metaphor however precludes the possibility of abandoning theism altogether. For the analogies of rape and worship intrinsically weave them together. Violence weaves them together. Rape is considered to be evil, and the others, animal sacrifice and crucifixion are sacred. That is not to say that rape is to be considered sacred or holy.

The Affective Power

The affective power of the metaphor, rape is worship, is dangerous. At the most literal level the metaphor might be construed as a license to rape. In the words of McFague, "to sum up, one must be careful of metaphors, they are not to be taken lightly."¹⁰ The affective power of this metaphor is twofold. First, it is dangerous, and second it is compelling. From quite a literal perspective the metaphor, rape is worship, might be construed as a license to rape. If God can rape Mary, then men have divine permission to rape women. It might be suggested that criminals commit acts of rape for religious reasons, and therefore ought not to be charged. Judges 21 establishes the precedent. The tribe of Benjamin ravage and rape the daughters of Shiloh, and they are not charged with a crime. They are rewarded with heirs to the kingdom of God. TePaske reports that Charles Manson "proclaimed himself Christ and elaborated an ideology of anarchic millennialism, an eschatology impending doom. . . . There are also numerous

¹⁰ Ibid., 42.

indications that members of Manson's family participated in the filmed sacrificial murders of young female victims." ¹¹

The second danger of this metaphor strikes at the heart of feminist issues, namely, the relationship of women to the kingdom of God. The first two analogies correlate the human value of a female with that of an animal. Within the context of this project women are identified as the property of men: their fathers, their brothers, and their spouses. Some might think that if the biblical interpretation is that women are the property of males, then seeking the legislation of the Equal Rights Amendment is contrary to the laws of God. It is germane to this project to raise to the consciousness of the reader the dangers of such literalistic thinking.

The compelling form of the affective power causes the reader to reflect and respond. Reflect, first, on the ministry of the church: preaching, education, and pastoral care. Then, respond to the injustices and pejorative treatment of women throughout the history of the kingdom of God. The only plausible response is the liberation of men and women from the bonds of patriarchal oppression within the kingdom of God, and the image of a patriarchal God who condones such oppression. Such is the task of a feminist theodicy.

Is the Metaphor Preachable?

Rape is worship; "Is the idea preachable?" This is a question most preachers raise. The answer is, covenant is always preachable. The Lucan birth narrative describes two contrasting conversations. One is Gabriel speaking with Zechariah, and the other is Gabriel speaking with Mary.

¹¹ TePaske, 59-60.

In the days of Herod, King of Judea, there was a priest named Zechariah, of the division of Eliiah; and he had a wife of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elizabeth. And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the the Lord blameless. But they had no child, because Elizabeth was barren, and both were advanced in years.

Now while he was serving as priest before God when his division was on duty, according to the custom of the priesthood, it fell to him by lot to enter the temple of the Lord and burn incense. 10 And the whole multitude of the people were praying outside at the hour of incense. 11 And there appeared to him an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense. 12 And Zechariah was troubled when he saw him, and fear fell upon him. 13 But the angel said to him, "Do not be afraid, Zechariah, for your prayer is heard, and your wife Elizabeth will bear you a son, and you shall call his name John. 14 And you will have joy and gladness, and many will rejoice at his birth; 15 for he will be great before the Lord, and he shall drink no wine nor strong drink, and he will be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb. 16 And he will turn many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God, 17 and he will go before him in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, to make ready for the Lord a people prepared."

18 And Zechariah said to the angel, "How shall I know this? For I am an old man, and my wife is advanced in years. 19 And the angel answered him, "I am Gabriel, who stand in the presence of God. And I was sent to speak to you, and to bring you this good news. 20 And behold, you will be silent and unable to speak until the day that these things come to pass, because you did not believe my word, which will be fulfilled in their time." 21 And the people were waiting for Zechariah, and they wondered at his delay in the temple. 22 And when he came out, he could not speak to them, and they perceived that he had seen a vision in the temple; and he made signs to them and remained dumb. 23 And when his time of service was ended, he went to his home.

24 After these days his wife Elizabeth conceived, and for five months she hid herself, saying, 25 "Thus the Lord has done to me in the days when he looked on me, to take away my reproach among men."

26 In the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God to a city of Galilee named Nazareth, 27 to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. 28 And he came to her and said, "Hail O favored one, the Lord is with you!" 29 But she was greatly troubled at the saying, and considered in her mind what sort of greeting this might be. 30 And the angel said to her, "Do not be afraid, Mary, for you have found favor with God. 31 And behold,

you will conceive in your womb and bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus. 32 He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High; and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David, 33 and he will reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there will be no end." 34 And Mary said to the Angel, "How can this be, since I have no husband? 35 And the angel said to her, "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the son of God. 36 And behold, your kinswoman Elizabeth in her old age has also conceived a son; and this is the sixth month with her who was called barren. 37 For with God nothing is impossible." 38 And Mary said, "Behold, I am the handmaid of the Lord; let it be to me according to your word." And the angel departed from her.

39 In those days Mary went with haste into the hill country, to a city of Judah, 40 and she entered the house of Zechariah and greeted Elizabeth. 41 And when Elizabeth heard the greeting of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit 42 and she exclaimed with a loud cry, "Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit of your womb! 43 And why is this granted to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? 44 For behold when the voice of your greeting came to my ear, the babe in my womb leaped for joy. 45 And blessed is she who believed that there would be a fulfillment of what was spoken to her from the Lord." 46 And Mary said, "My soul magnifies the Lord, 47 and my spirit rejoices in God my Savior, 48 for he has regarded the low estate of his handmaiden. For behold, henceforth all generations will call me blessed."¹²

There are three striking differences between the conversation with Zechariah and the conversation with Mary. First, Gabriel comes to Zechariah in response to their prayer; the desire for a child is initiated by Zechariah and Elizabeth. Gabriel says to Zechariah, "Do not be afraid, Zechariah, for your prayer is heard." Zechariah and Elizabeth, unlike Mary and Joseph, are reminiscent of Abraham and Sarah.

¹² Luke 1.5-48.

But Abram said, " O Lord, God, what wilt thou give me, for I continue childless. . . . Behold, thou hast given me no offspring"¹³
 Now Sarai, Abram's wife bore him no children.¹⁴

Zechariah and Elizabeth are also described as childless, for "Elizabeth was barren."

Abraham disbelieves God when the birth covenant is offered.

And God said to Abraham, " As for Sarai your wife , you shall not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall be her name. 16 I will bless her, and moreover, I will give you a son by her. . . . 17 Then Abraham fell on his face and laughed, and said to himself, "Shall a child be born to a man who is a hundred year old? Shall Sarah, who is ninety years old, bear a child?"¹⁵

Abraham prays for a son. God's response is to Abraham first, and not to Sarah.¹⁶ God approaches and promises a son to Abraham. Abraham's response is one of disbelief. Likewise Gabriel doesn't approach Elizabeth. Gabriel comes to Zechariah. Zechariah's response was a similar disbelief, "How shall I know this? For I am an old man, and my wife is advanced in years." The angel acknowledges Zechariah's disbelief, "And behold, you will be silent and unable to speak until the day that these things come to pass, because you did not believe my words, which will be fulfilled in their time."¹⁷

Second, Gabriel's conversation with Mary is, in contrast, not reminiscent of the Genesis story. Gabriel is not responding to an intercession from Mary.

¹³ Gen. 15.2-3.

¹⁴ Gen. 16.1.

¹⁵ Gen. 17.15-17.

¹⁶ Both the Priestly (Gen. 17.15-21) and Yahwist (Gen. 18.9-15) accounts of this conversation preclude a direct conversation between God and Sarah.

¹⁷ Luke 1.20.

Mary is not suspected to be advanced in years, although it is commonly understood she is without a child. Using the same phrase employed in the conversation with Zechariah; Gabriel explicitly states that it is God who is initiating the contact. "Do not be afraid, Mary, for you have found favor with God."¹⁸ God seeks a direct and immediate relationship with a betrothed female. God does not recognize that because Mary is the property of Joseph that should preclude her from a direct covenant with God. In freedom the God of Grace seeks her as a handmaiden. She may indeed be governed by a society which defines her a property, but Gabriel declares her liberation, she is free to enter this incarnational covenant with God. Even the lawful boundaries of the patriarchy cannot exclude Mary from the prevenient grace of God.

Third, Mary's response to the angel is not one of disbelief. Fearful though she is, she responds courageously, and out of her own conviction, "Behold, I am a handmaid of the Lord, let it be to me according to your word."

Zechariah's disbelief results in his inability to proclaim the vision to the people, "And when he came out, he could not speak to them."¹⁹ Mary on the other hand, speaks prophetically to Elizabeth, her kinswoman, about the conversation she has with Gabriel. "My soul magnifies the Lord, he has regarded the low estate of this handmaiden. He has done great things for me."²⁰ Mary reveals her own consciousness in this song, that God reaches

¹⁸ Luke 1.30.

¹⁹ Luke 1.22.

²⁰ Luke 1.47-48.

through the oppression of her lowly status, seeking her liberation, by establishing this covenant of the incarnation. Mary's revelation is the profound difference between the two conversations in Luke, and Genesis. This revelation represents the transformative powers of God. God seeks covenant with a lowly women to bring about this new realm, the ever coming realm of Christ.

Is this preachable? God's liberating love, and prevenient grace, and covenant are always preachable.

Education

Is the church ignoring the equality of women and, thus, inculcating in the minds of men and women that rape is the divine right of all men? Is the church, by ignoring the low estate of women in the Bible, implanting in the minds of men and women that the status and role of a woman is reduced to that of property, just another animal?

The source of affective learning in the church for centuries has been participation in worship.²¹ Worship is a living experience. Rape is a living experience. Neither are easily forgotten.

The metaphor, rape is worship, challenges Christian educators to examine the question: What is it that men and women are learning from these ancient Biblical texts? This is in addition to the question: What are we teaching?

The metaphor of rape is worship serves as an affective catalyst compelling religious educators to correct the falsehoods perpetuated in the patriarchal stories; women are the property of men, and women are equated

²¹ John Westerhoff and Otis Carl Edwards, A Faithful Church (Wilton, Conn.: Morehouse-Barlow, 1981), 293-314.

with animals. Women may be oppressed throughout the kingdom of God, but the Lucan pericope announces that God seeks a direct conventional relationship with women.

Pastoral Care

The third chapter of this project models a new image of Mary. Mary, the mother of Jesus, is portrayed as a victim of rape. This model has affective power in the ministry of pastoral care for both men and women.

The affective power in the care of women who are victims of rape, is endless. Mary is the model for empowering, as opposed to her traditional role as the helpless, and powerless female. The text makes it evident that Mary did not ask to be raped. It was God who sought her. It was God who found favor with her. Mary is a victim. She recognizes the dangers when she identifies herself as betrothed, and then does what is necessary to survive. She submits. Mary has a choice; she makes the choice for herself. If Mary has a choice with God, then other women also have a choice. Women have choices in their relationships with their husbands, and with boyfriends.²² Mary as a model of a survivor opens the door for others to survive the act of rape as well as to suggest that women do have the right to say, "No" or fight for their lives. The studies of Bart and O'Brien tend to show that women who resist their attackers have stopped the rape assault.²³ The studies of Burgess

²² Diana Russell, Rape in Marriage (New York: Collier, 1982). Russell's study comprehensively explores the issue of spousal rape.

²³ Pauline B. Bart and Patricia H. O'Brien, Stopping Rape (Oxford: Pergamon, 1985). Bart and O'Brien present a study of the women who have stopped the rape assault.

and Holstrom show that rape victims experience protracted and debilitating feelings of powerlessness, and helplessness. Any choice or decision a woman makes in rape is some evidence of power and control, which can help the person recover from such devastation. Within the boundaries of the patriarchal kingdom of God, Mary's choice may have been a matter of survival. If Mary had been able to perceive herself as a free individual, then her decisions might have been to enter a covenant with God, or to say no, and know the freedom to respond in that way.

The rape of Mary has additional possibilities in the pastoral care of men. When this is viewed as myth from a Jungian perspective, the message is clear: God seeks to be in direct relationship with the female side of our personality. God seeks this side of our personality for an incarnational covenant. Psychologically, this birth covenant would be essential to the creative process. This message clearly refutes TePaske's concern that rape is a problem of the male process of ego individuation.²⁴ On the contrary, rape and rape fantasy are not necessary for healthful ego individuation. The male persona must seek reconciliation with the female persona. This is the essence of the incarnational covenant with Mary.

The Structural Power

Ruether makes the point that as a Christian church we have barely begun to recognize the seriousness of the problem of patriarchal language, be it in the liturgy of worship, or the translating and exegesis of biblical texts. Ruether argues that the use of inclusive pronouns only scratches the surface

²⁴ TePaske, 58.

of the problem of feminist theology.²⁵ Fiorenza elaborates that the Biblical protagonists and antagonists are predominantly male, because the Bible has been redacted by males.²⁶

McFague pronounces a resolution that "metaphors are multilayered," and can begin to unearth the roots of feminist theology, and biblical exegesis.²⁷ McFague suggests "that the primordial level of our lives is the stuff from which metaphor is made."²⁸

This metaphor, kingdom of God, affected the structure of the historical reality surrounding the life of Jesus. At that time in history, kingdom of God was a shocking new metaphor that promised liberation, hope, and new life. Historically, the kingdom of God is essential to the proclamation of the gospel. The kingdom of God has a liberating ring to the ears of the early listener as it is proclaimed against the decrees of Caesar Augustus. "In those days a decree went out from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled. This was the first enrollment, when Quirinius was governor of Syria."²⁹ The power of the kingdom of God is not thwarted by all the world's enrollment, for in the midst of this act of victory, a child is born, and his birth is proclaimed to all people. "For to you is born this day in the city of David a savior who is Christ the Lord."³⁰ Gabriel says to Mary, "And the Lord God will give to

²⁵ Rosemary Ruether, "Christology and Feminism," 1.

²⁶ Fiorenza, Bread Not Stone, 15-16.

²⁷ McFague, 36-37.

²⁸ Ibid., 37.

²⁹ Luke 2.1-2.

³⁰ Luke 2.11.

him the throne of his father David."³¹ The heir to the throne of David is born. The message to the people is that God's reigning kingdom cannot be halted even by Caesar Augustus.

The feminist metaphor, rape is worship, jolts into the shocking reality that the kingdom of God ceases to be a liberating metaphor. Kingdom of God is a patriarchal metaphor.³² It is a dead metaphor, for it no longer rings of liberation.

God has been modeled in masculine images (excluding feminine ones) and as a consequence the notion has arisen that men have godlike attributes.³³

The power of the patriarchal model [kingdom of God] is both its inclusiveness and its exclusiveness. It expands to include all of heaven and earth, and in so doing orders all of reality in a hierarchy in which women are always subordinate and invariably identified with the inferior or bodily dimensions of life. In this inclusive model woman is defined only in relationship to man-as man's "other," as that part of man from which he is alienated and which both fascinates and disgusts him. But the model excludes women as well by not naming them, by refusing to include their functions and occupations as metaphors for God that will return to them as models for their own self-identity. The patriarchal model oppresses women as much by what it does not say about woman as by what it does say. What it does say defines her as inferior; what it does not say leaves her without alternatives.³⁴

The theological and structural power of the metaphor rape is worship collapses the liberating power of the kingdom of God. For "a system fostering male superiority at all levels of personal and public life, is a serious

³¹ Luke 1.32.

³² McFague, 164. According to McFague, feminist "reformers believe that the root-metaphor of Christianity is human liberation, not patriarchy, and that liberation for women can occur within the Christian paradigm."

³³ Ibid., 147.

³⁴ Ibid., 150.

perversion of Jesus's understanding of the father model and utterly opposed to the root-metaphor of Christianity which is against all worldly hierarchies."³⁵

Rape is worship uncovers the treatment of women, and their value to men within the kingdom of God. Rape is taken to be a normative treatment of women. Men alone sustain and maintain their righteous relationship with God as the exclusive heirs of the kingdom of God. Rape is uncovered within the kingdom of God according to male redacted content of both the Old and New Testaments.

Biblical patriarchy restricts and oppresses the power of women. Patriarchy restricts and limits the human understanding of God to that of a patriarch. Rape is worship may eventually lead to the complete and utter rejection of the patriarchal kingdom of God. Even the power of the patriarchy cannot restrict the omnipotence of Deity to overcome adversity.

Nevertheless, this project insists that God's intention in the rape of Mary is not humiliation and subjugation of women. It is the patriarchal oppression of women which has denied the woman, Mary, the world-view that God would want her in covenant relationship. The inculcation of patriarchal laws in her enculturation forbade her the opportunity to think that God would seek her for a direct covenant. Mary could only perceive herself as the property of Joseph. God is neither a villain, nor a rapist: God's goodness remains intact. God's contact with Mary is divine intervention. God seeks to be in a direct covenant with Mary. Yet the same patriarchal laws deny God the freedom to seek a covenant with Mary. These allegations question the goodness of the patriarchal understanding of the kingdom of God, without

³⁵ Ibid., 167.

challenging the ultimate goodness of the Divine. Historically, the kingdom of God proposes the same liberating relationship for the heirs to the kingdom of God. They did not have to be subjugated to the oppression of Caesar Augustus.

Schwendinger and Schwendinger claim that patriarchy oppresses males as well. Their studies indicate that the inequality among males leads to high incidents of the rape of women.

Mergers of ideological standpoints again suggest that the motivational dynamics of sexual assault link rapists and victims to the political economy as a whole.

For the most part, fertile soil for the development of this perspective [a female as a worthless being] exists whenever the rapacious individualism of capitalism is combined with long-term economic instability, the repression of working class consciousness, and the reorganization of everyday social relations around undisguised forms of exploitation. Since these conditions are concentrated among marginal members of the labor force, studies find that a higher incidence of rape is committed by marginally employed or totally unemployed younger men. In the Philadelphia study by Amir as many as 90 percent of the sexual aggressors for both races were at the lower end of the occupational scale.

We point out that, in victimization studies, the most economically deprived women reported a far greater incidence of rape than any other group. This finding will be related to the social dynamics that induce higher crime rates among young males, especially in ghetto and slum communities.³⁶

Schwendinger and Schwendinger portray patriarchy as a society of inequality within countries where Christianity is practiced. In patriarchy males subjugated to the stress of 'rapacious individualism', competition, repression of the working class consciousness, long-term economic instability, in turn resort to the subjugation and inevitably the rape of women. The present day kingdom of God describes this society.

³⁶ Schwendinger and Schwendinger, 204-206.

The metaphor, kingdom of God, stresses the patriarchy, ergo the oppression of men and their rape of women. Men are the servants of God; men represent the repressed working class in the kingdom of God. Women are the servants of men. The metaphor, rape is worship, compels the Christian community to affect the structural power of the traditional Christian reality known as the kingdom of God. No longer can we hold the idea that Mary held of herself, as the property of Joseph, or the idea that the angel's advances were rape, or the idea that God chooses to rape women because God establishes covenants only with patriarchs. God's treatment of Mary subverts the patriarchy. God offers a woman, not a man, the incarnational covenant, or a covenant of birth. In history, Mary is the property of Joseph. God renounces ownership, acknowledging Mary's independence and freedom to enter into a creation covenant. If Mary were free, she would choose. Today, many women have the opportunity to choose, and to acknowledge that God desires direct covenant. No longer must women conceive of themselves as servants of men in order to serve God. God's covenant with Mary moves away from rapacious individualism. For of this covenant, Gabriel says "there will be no end."³⁷

Concluding Remarks

This project shows that violence is central to worship as rape, animal sacrifice, and crucifixion. It may be horrifying to grasp that the integrity of worship hinges on violence. One can react and shun worship, and new symbols can be substituted. It is beyond the scope of this project to suggest that worship be changed, or how it might be changed. In worship, violence is

³⁷ Luke 1.33b.

sacred, and in rape, violence is evil. Human beings have made the distinction. There is no evidence presented which shows that God declares one good and one evil. What is shown is that human beings seek God through some evil events and in some sacred events. Further, God seeks covenant with human beings in spite of the humanly imposed limitations on society. There is every indication that God will continue to do so, in spite of whatever humanity does to alter worship or society.

Bibliography

Works Cited

- Amir, Menachem. Patterns in Forcible Rape. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Bart, Pauline B., and Patricia H. O'Brien. Stopping Rape: Successful Survival Strategies. Oxford: Pergamon, 1985.
- Biale, Rachel. Women and Jewish Law. New York: Schocken, 1984.
- Boling, Robert. Judges. Vol. 6a of The Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975.
- Bright, John. The Kingdom of God: The Biblical Concept and Its Meaning for the Church. Nashville: Abingdon, 1983.
- Brooten, Bernadette. "Violence Against Women in Rabbinic Literature." Paper. Beyond Violence Conference, Claremont Women in Religion, Claremont, Ca., 28 Feb. 1985.
- Brown, Raymond. The Birth of the Messiah. Garden City, NY: Image Books, 1979.
- . The Gospel According to John, I-XII. Vol. 29 of The Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Brownmiller, Susan. Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1975.
- Burgess, Ann, and Lynda Holmstrom. Rape: Victims of Crisis. Bowie, Md.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
- California, State of. Department of Justice. Crime In California. Sacramento: 1981.
- California, State of. Department of Justice. Women's Rights. Sacramento: 1983.
- Campbell, Joseph. Occidental Mythology. Vol. 3 of The Masks of God. New York: Viking, 1964.

- , ed. The Portable Jung. Trans. R.F.C. Hull. New York: Penguin, 1971.
- Caputi, Jane. The Age of Sex Crime. Bowling Green, Oh.: Bowling Green Univ. Popular Press, 1987.
- Daly, Mary. Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation. Boston: Beacon, 1973.
- . The Church and the Second Sex. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- . Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism. Boston: Beacon, 1978.
- Davis, Stephen, et al. Encountering Evil. Atlanta: John Knox, 1981.
- De Vaux, Roland. Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1964.
- Duran, Fray Diego. Book of the Gods and Rites and the Ancient Calendar. Norman: Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1971.
- Edinger, Edward. Ego and Archetype: Individuation and the Religious Function of the Psyche. Harrisonburg, Va.: Peguin, 1972.
- Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schussler. Bread Not Stone: The Challenge of Feminist Biblical Interpretation. Boston: Beacon, 1984.
- . In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christians Origins. New York: Crossroad, 1986.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph. The Gospel According to Luke, I-IX. Vol. 28 of The Anchor Bible. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979.
- Fortune, Marie. Sexual Violence: The Unmentionable Sin. New York: Pilgrim, 1983.
- Fowler, James. Stages of Faith: The Psychology of Human Development and the Quest for Meaning. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981.
- Frazer, James George, and Theodore H. Gaster. The New Golden Bough. Great Meadows, NJ: S. G. Phillips, 1965.
- Girard, René. Violence and the Sacred. Baltimore: John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1977.

- Green, Alberto. The Role of Human Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Groth, A. Nicholas, and Jean Birnbaum. Men Who Rape: The Psychology of the Offender. New York: Plenum, 1979.
- Harrison, Jane. Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion. London: Merlin Press, 1980.
- Hick, John. Evil and the God of Love. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1977.
- James, Oliver Edwin. Christian Myth and Ritual. London: Murray, 1933.
- Jung, Carl. "Transformation Symbolism in the Mass." Psychology and Western Religion. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1984.
- Jung, Carl, and Carl Kerényi. Essays on a Science of Mythology. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1973.
- Madden, Edward, and Peter H. Hare. Evil and the Concept of God. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1968.
- Martin, James. The Book of Judges. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1973.
- Mascall, Edwin Lionel. Existence and Analogy. London: Longmans, Green, 1949.
- McFague, Sallie. Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- Morton, Nelle. The Journey is Home. Boston: Beacon, 1985.
- Pomeroy, Sarah. Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity. New York: Schocken, 1975.
- Porter, Joshua Roy. Leviticus. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976.
- Reiling, J., and J. L. Swellengrebel. A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Rodriguez, Angel. Substitution in the Hebrew Cultus. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews Univ. Press, 1979.
- Rowland, Judith. Ultimate Violation. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.

- Ruether, Rosemary. "Christology and Feminism: Can A Male Savior Help Women?". Occasional Papers. [United Methodist Board of Education and Ministry] 1, no. 13, (Dec. 25, 1976).
- . Mary: The Feminine Face of the Church. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977.
- . Sexism and God-Talk: Toward A Feminist Theology. Boston: Beacon, 1983.
- Russell, Diana. Rape in Marriage. New York: Collier, 1982.
- Russell, Letty, et al. Feminist Interpretation of the Bible. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1985.
- Sanders, James. Torah and Canon. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.
- Schaberg, Jane. The Illegitimacy of Jesus: A Feminist Theological Interpretation of the Infancy Narratives. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Schwendinger, Julia, and Herman Schwendinger.. Rape and Inequality. Beverly Hills: Sage Publs., 1983.
- Spretnak, Charlene. Lost Goddesses of Early Greece. Boston: Beacon, 1978.
- Stone, Merlin. When God Was a Woman. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1976.
- Symonds, Martin. "The Rape Victim: Psychological Patterns of Response." American Journal of Psychoanalysis 36 (1976): 27-34.
- Taylor, Vincent. "Luke, Gospel of." Vol. 3 of Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon, 1962.
- TePaske, Bradley. Rape and Ritual. Toronto: Inner City Books, 1982.
- Trible, Phyllis. Texts of Terror. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Underhill, Evelyn. Worship. Westport, Conn.: Hyperion Press, 1937.
- West, James King. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: Macmillan, 1981.
- Westerhoff, John III, and Otis Carl Edwards. A Faithful Church: Issues in the History of Catechesis. Wilton, Conn.: Morehouse-Barlow, 1981.

Westerhoff, John III, and William Willimon. Learning and Liturgy through the Life Cycle. New York: Seabury, 1980.

White, James. Introduction to Christian Worship. Nashville: Abingdon, 1980.

Works Consulted

Burgess, Ann, and Lynda Holstrom. "Rape: Sexual Disruption and Recovery," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 49, no. 4 (Oct. 1979): 648-657.

Clark, Lorene, and Debra Lewis. Rape: The Price of Coercive Sexuality. Toronto: Women's Press, 1977.

Cullman, Oscar. Early Christian Worship. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1953.

Daly, Mary. Pure Lust: Elemental Feminist Philosophy. Boston: Beacon, 1984.

Griffin, Susan. Rape: The Power of Consciousness. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979.

Hoon, Paul. The Integrity of Worship. Nashville: Abingdon, 1971.

Katz, Judy. No Fairy Godmothers, No Magic Wands: The Healing Process After Rape. Saratoga, Ca.: R & E Publs., 1984.

Leith, John. Creeds of the Churches. Atlanta: John Knox, 1982.

Ochs, Carol. Behind the Sex of God. Boston: Beacon, 1977.

Offir, Carole Wade. "Don't Take It Lying Down." Psychology Today, Jan. 1975: 73-76.

Pellauer, Mary. "Violence Against Women: The Theological Dimension." Christianity and Crisis, May 1983: 206-212.

Russell, Diana. The Politics of Rape: The Victim's Perspective. New York: Stein & Day, 1974.

Ruether, Rosemary. Religion and Sexism: Images of Women in the Jewish and Christian Traditions. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1974.

Selkin, James. "Rape is a Scare Word." Psychology Today, Jan. 1975: 71-76.